

ENGLISH STUDIES.

A JOURNAL OF ENGLISH
LETTERS AND PHILOLOGY.

Edited by
E. KRUISINGA and R. W. ZANDVOORT.

With a Supplement.

1928

VOLUME TEN

10-12
1928-30
N^{OS} 1-6

Published by

Messrs. SWETS & ZEITLINGER, Keizersgracht, AMSTERDAM.

CONTENTS.

ARTICLES.

	Page
B. A. P. VAN DAM,	The Taming of a Shrew 97.
_____ ,	The Taming of the Shrew 161.
L. P. H. EIJKMAN,	More Soft Palate and Nasality 114.
W. VAN DER GAAP,	The Gerund preceded by the Common
_____ ,	Case 33, 65.
_____ ,	The Predicative Passive Infinitive 107.
_____ ,	The Post-adjectival Passive Infinitive. 129.
M. PRAZ,	Wyndham Lewis 1.
_____ ,	Poets and Wits of the Restoration 41.
B. TRNKA,	Analysis and Synthesis in English 138.

REVIEWS.

W. VAN DOORN,	Psychology and Primitive Culture (Bartlett) 58.
_____ ,	Studien zur Geschichte und Charakteristik
_____ ,	des Refrains in der englischen Literatur
_____ ,	(Ruhrmann) 88.
_____ ,	The Kinds of Poetry (Erskine). 154.
_____ ,	Some Contemporary Poets, 1920. (Monro) 154.
_____ ,	An Anatomy of Poetry (Williams-Ellis) 154.
_____ ,	On English Poetry (Graves) 154.
_____ ,	Poetic Unreason and Other Studies 154.
_____ ,	An Anthology of Recent Poetry (Walters) 187.
_____ ,	English Verse Old and New (Mead-Clift) 187.
_____ ,	Modern American Poets (Aiken) 187.
_____ ,	Modern American Poetry (Untermeyer). 187.
_____ ,	Sixty-Three Poems (Gibson, ed. Parker) 187.

W. VAN DER GAAF,	The Court of Sapience (Spindler) <i>no 10-12</i>	18.
_____ ,	John Page's Siege of Rouen (Huscher) .	18.
_____ ,	A Stanzaic Life of Christ (ed. Foster) .	182.
H. DE GROOT,	As You Like It (ed. Quiller - Couch & Dover Wilson)	55.
C. B. VAN HAERINGEN,	A Dictionary of the Low Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary (Bense). . .	183.
_____ ,	Niederländisches Lehngut im Mittel- englischen (Toll)	183.
A. G. VAN HAMEL,	Arthur of Britain (E. K. Chambers) . .	14.
_____ ,	Medieval Studies in memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis	76.
E. KRUISINGA,	English Synonyms and Homonyms (Günther-de Maar)	157.
J. MANSION,	The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire (Mawer & Stenton) .	11.
W. A. OVAA,	German Influence in the English Romantic Period 1788-1810 (Stokoe)	122.
_____ ,	Horace Walpole (Stuart)	186.
H. J. POS,	Neuaufbau der Grammatik (Kalepky) . .	185.
M. PRAZ,	The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets (Robertson)	22.
_____ ,	Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geniebegriffs in England (Thüme)	26.
_____ ,	Seneca his Tenne Tragedies (ed. Whibley)	79.
_____ ,	Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca (Eliot).	79.
_____ ,	The Road to Xanadu (Lowes)	125.
_____ ,	The Complete Works of John Webster (ed. Lucas)	146.
A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH,	The Poems of John Philips (ed. Lloyd Thomas).	120.
R. W. ZANDVOORT,	A Syntax of Living English (Vechtman-Veth)	27.
_____ ,	An English Grammar for Dutch Students, vol I, 4 th ed. (Kruisinga).	27.

MISCELLANEOUS.

	Page
Current Letters and Philology:	
6. Criticism and Biography (A. G. van Kranendonk)	89
Points of Modern English Syntax	73.
Notes and News.	
F. Karpf, Prepositional Accusative with Plain Infinitive, 9; A-Examen 1927, 9; English Association in Holland, 11, 146; International Congress of Linguists, 53, 73; B-Examen 1927, 53; The Oxford Dictionary, 72; The New English Dictionary, 144; Prijsvraag Groningse Universiteit, 73; De Opleiding van de Taalleraar, 118; Het Instituut der Biezondere Leerstoelen, 119; Wijziging Examenprogramma Middelbare Akten, 120; Cambridge Summer Meeting, 145; De Examens voor de Vreemde Talen, 177; Leerstoelen voor de Moderne Talen aan alle Universiteiten? 179; Docendi Ars Docenda, 180.	
Brief Mentions	92, 128, 158.
Bibliographies	30, 59, 92, 159, 189.

Wyndham Lewis.

If I had to introduce Wyndham Lewis to Italian readers I would perhaps start by comparing him with Giovanni Papini, whereas the personality of Otto Weininger could supply me with a good clue before a German-speaking public. By way of approximation, take the corrosive criticism of the author of *Stroncuture*, mix it with the metaphysical enthusiasm of the author of *Geschlecht und Character*, and serve the concoction piping hot: the result should not be very different from a mock-Lewis. It is by no means a common fact in the records of English literature to find a writer specialising in pitiless exposures, the Punch spirit of benevolent banter usually prevailing also in the higher spheres of criticism. No less uncommon is the appearance of a mind showing an unquenchable interest in metaphysics, the sort of feverish longing for a system which is different from the serene speculation of the born philosopher.

Once we are aware how rare is in England the phenomenon of a mind combining a habit of scathing analysis with a power of embracing wide vistas of metaphysical concepts, we might perhaps feel tempted to set down that phenomenon to a hypothetical factor of race, had not Lewis himself opportunely warned us several times in his work against the fallacy of racial interpretations (though this author occasionally indulges in stressing the racial factor, as when he seems not disinclined to trace the perfection of Tuscan art of the Renaissance to a possible Asiatic strain proceeding from the largely oriental slave population of Rome!)

Personal considerations of this kind would hardly come to the foreground in the case of most critics and philosophers. Theories and criticisms, of all individual utterances, possess the least of personal bias. But in our case one is constantly made aware of the presence of the begetter of the theories and criticisms; his overbearing personality is behind them, causing them to appear as so many idiosyncrasies. See how he stresses the personal factor: "I have allowed these contradictory things to struggle together, and the group that has proved the most powerful I have fixed upon as my most essential ME."

It is not so much with a work that we have to do, as with an author. You may disagree with some of his opinions, find other ones too hastily concocted, and too perfunctorily dished; what you cannot possibly deny is the stimulating character of those writings and the qualifications of excellent trainer of the mind their author displays. Very appropriately, in his preface to *Book First of Time and Western Man*,¹⁾ Lewis is claiming for himself "such a position as Socrates might occupy in a world of such people as the Cynics and the Megarians, with the inevitable extremism of a certain sort that would most likely result."

I am issuing a 'challenge' to the community in which I live. I am 'criticising all its institutions and modes of action and of thought'. I 'create disgust', that I have proved, 'among the ordinary respectable members of the community', ... what I say is 'violently resented', and I very sincerely hope will 'awaken thought'.

Nowhere better than in the case of Wyndham Lewis, those adjectives could be produced which are so dear to the average English critic: *stimulating*,

¹⁾ London, Chatto and Windus, 1927, pp. 488, 21 s. net.

provocative, illuminating, arresting: those hackneyed adjectives which give such an accurate description of the almost proverbial amateurishness of the English public.

The Enemy is the title of a review Wyndham Lewis has been editing — or rather composing, since he is almost the sole contributor — from the beginning of 1927 (the second number appeared in September), “with the object to carry on a constant campaign for a system of ideas which he wishes to propagate”. The most conspicuous feature of the campaign is provided, of course, by the attacks “on the grand scale against the radical institutions in the ascendant in the world of art and letters”. “A man of understanding is to benefit by his enemies” — runs the quotation from Plutarch’s *Moralia* prefixed as a motto to the review. If Lewis’s frame of mind might be regarded as somehow unusual among English men of letters, on the other hand his system of advertising is decidedly planned on the most familiar English lines: one is almost led to picture the *Enemy* banner hoisted over the orange box of some orator at Marble Arch. Even the cover of the second number of *The Enemy*, with its arresting pattern and interwoven bits of sentences, seems calculated to appeal precisely to that emotional side of the public which the review, however, intends to reprove. But quite likely I have not caught the spirit of Lewis’s designs; what to me seems not so very different from Apollinaire’s *calligrammes* and the ingenuities of the Futurists, must certainly receive a diametrically opposite explanation at the hands of the author, otherwise how could he reconcile it with his philosophical creed? Anyhow I am not going here to discuss Lewis as a plastic artist, but as a writer.

As a writer he intends to be popular, since he aims at counteracting the influence of those widely read middlemen whose popularisation of certain points of view is held responsible for the present chaotic state of the western mind. *The Enemy* is meant to be an antidote against “intoxicants for herd-consumption”. All the various fields of contemporary life are investigated by Lewis in order to detect and denounce the virus of the great pseudo-revolutionary movement back to the primitive world. According to Lewis, this movement is initiated, in philosophy, by Schopenhauer and von Hartmann, gains ground with Bergson, culminates in Relativism and the English mathematical philosophers (Russell, Whitehead, Alexander), and finds an extremely infectious popular expression in Spengler, with his ‘chronological’ philosophy. The literary counterpart of it is found in the works of Proust, Joyce, Gertrude Stein, all of whom instance a conception of life akin to that of the Time-philosophers (*Time and Western Man*, Book I), while, on the other hand, the tendency to a return to earlier forms of life, where intuition and emotion should rule sovereign (a tendency parallel to the sex-primitivism initiated by Freud), is shown to be the keynote of such writers as D. H. Lawrence and Sherwood Anderson (*Paleface*, in *The Enemy*, vol. II). This, in the bare outlines, the survey of contemporary society which Lewis carries on with very acute and consistent analysis and a considerable amount of learning. But one thing we must bear in mind, while reading Lewis’s brilliant demolitions: that he is discussing philosophers chiefly in the form in which they have been interpreted to the average cultivated mind. He takes them as they appear to people of middle culture, already digested into sharply outlined formulae. Only in this sense can we allow Lewis to bundle together people of such different standing and importance as, for instance, Croce and Spengler.

Let us examine more accurately the positions of these two personalities,

as they appear in Lewis's book — and possibly to most people who are content with a mere smattering of philosophical notions — and, then, as they are in reality, when studied more closely. For Lewis "the Italian idealism, under the composite banner of 'Time', marches together in perfect fundamental unison with Alexander, with Bergson or with James". For Lewis the pith of Croce's philosophy is contained in the formula: 'History is the present Reality'. Thus much he has read in Wildon Carr's account of Croce, which appears to be the only Crocian text Lewis has come across (incidentally, we must deplore the bad luck of Croce in being allotted a clumsy English translator, D. Ainslie, and a populariser of an extremely amateurish character; but what populariser is not?). Presently Lewis proceeds to stultify his compendious Croce, his Italian idealism *in nuce* (and a rotten nut it appears to be), much on the lines of Voltaire's stultification of Pangloss's optimism. Has Carr not said that "every new present action modifies the past?" Let us take this literally:

It is *tremendously exciting* to think that we are actually *making history with our own hands* — and — just think of it! 'History' is *all there is*! So we are all there is, too! We are *creating* — anything there is to create. Again, history does not *stay up*. It jumps up and helps us. We find, with a gasp of delight, that *it is us* all the time. We look round, and there is Julius Caesar, with a cheery smile, in blue overalls and sandals, come to give us a hand! It is all so glorious and splendid, when you come to think of it, etc., etc.

This may be very funny, and, in a way, may successfully serve Lewis's popular aim, of showing the absurdity of a formula he thinks dangerous (certain passage in Pirandello's *Henry IV* might have served as well), but it is hardly fair to a philosopher whose earnestness and value cannot be disposed of so lightly and hastily. It may be convenient to Lewis, always with an eye on propaganda, to knit in the same string of names Croce and Spengler; but he ought not to ignore that Croce, as early as 1920, wrote against Spengler, in a much more concise form, many of the very things Lewis is credited by an enthusiastic reviewer (Mr. Humbert Wolfe in *The Observer* for Oct. 9th 1927) with having pointed out first: "If Mr. W. Lewis had done nothing more in *Time* and *Western Man*, he would at least be entitled to general gratitude for having ground Spengler's pretensions to powder." From this piece of candid eulogy a good deal of fun could be extracted by a critic in a Wyndham Lewis strain. But we confine ourselves to remark that, while Lewis's dressing down of Spengler may do some service on the plane of popularisation, Spengler's would-be philosophy never met with the consideration of serious thinkers. Least of all, of Croce, whose words (from *La Critica*, vol. XVIII, 1920, p. 236) I now proceed to quote:

The success met by this book [Spengler's *Untergang des Abendlandes*] in Germany is bound to rouse serious concern in any one who takes to heart the destinies of scientific work. . . . Herr Spengler ignores altogether the history of the problems he is discussing, and both his ideas and his erudition are a dilettante's. . . . And, since he ignores that history, he fancies he has made wonderful discoveries, sure to upset the accepted scientific views, at every incondite combination of concepts, at every half-truth on which he hits.

Spengler's great discovery is shown by Croce to be nothing else but the hypothesis of the cyclical movement of history, one of the oldest thoughts of humanity, developed by G. B. Vico in the XVIIIth Century and elaborated during the following ages:

But about this mass of critical literature Herr Spengler is completely in the dark, and in consequence of his ignorance and simplicity his book is unworthy of criticism; nor will I take pains to discuss and refute it. There are better things

to do. How could I discuss it, since I find in all its parts the same inconsistency of method? Leaving all this, I come to Herr Spengler's political forecast: a deeply pessimistic forecast which, because of the laborious crisis the great German nation is now traversing, threatens to find ready and general acceptance and to produce follies, weaknesses and mental and moral harms, similar to those the theories of Chamberlain and such like produced at the time of pan-Germanism and war preparation.

Whatever Lewis has to say about Spengler's 'exceeding foolishness', 'congenital stupidity', 'insane inconsistencies' and harmful influence, has been anticipated by Croce's short review. It was worth while to repeat it, if that harmful influence is still at work, but in mentioning side by side Croce and Spengler, Lewis confesses to the same ignorance and confusion he is denouncing in Spengler.

Spengler's amazing disclosures about the doom of the western races, in my opinion, find their fit place in the literature of charlatans and fortune-tellers. His garbling of historical events is no less fanciful than those amusing *centones vergilian*, in which Vergil was caused to adumbrate passages of the Bible (Proba Falconia put together an account of the Fall with scraps of Vergilian lines); while Spengler's lugubrious rant over the decline of the West is a penny dreadful of the same order as Péladan's *éthopée*, *La Décadence Latine*, of which here is a 'powerful' passage:

. et, vivement levé, il écrivit du crayon phosphoré qu'il avait à la main, sur le tableau noir: FINIS LATINORUM. Dans la nuit absolue de la salle, les lettres fatidiques flavesçaient, et le regard de ces trois hommes recula et leur esprit s'effara en voyant écrite, comme avec du feu, leur désespérance. Ils ne parlèrent plus, les yeux hypnotisés sur l'inscription qui peu à peu s'effaçait; et les dernières phosphorescences s'évanouirent et la nuit absolue se refit. Ils voyaient toujours la terrible sentence qui leur brûlait le cœur. Haletants, l'intelligence éperdue, ils se répétaient dans une indescriptible terreur mentale: FINIS LATINORUM.

But if it were merely to fight against a grotesque childish nightmare similar to the one just described that Lewis had written his book, he would not command our attention for long. Neither would he keep our attention by his strictures on Bergson, which have been made several times before, though not in the present drastic form (Bergson is represented as a servant of the vulgar mercantile class "taking their money to do, philosophically, their dirty work"), nor by his brilliant cutting up of the *organic mechanism* of Whitehead and of Alexander's idea of God. The hypotheses of these two latter philosophers, moulded on the very unsettled state of contemporary physics, are too hazy to admit of precise criticism. Finally, the author's constructive part, his attempt at describing the Divine in terms of concreteness and plastic art — a God whose opposition to the musical ever-becoming God of the Time-philosophers reminds one of the original contrast lying at the root of all philosophic systems, the Parmenides v. Heraclitus conflict —, his partial agreement with the thomist doctrine, have still too much the nature of tentative approximations, rather than of rigorous principles, to ask for criticism, though the vivid, forcible style in which they are couched makes those pages pleasant to read. After all, on the author's own confession, the essay has been written not with a view to promote any theory of his own, but only to supply a fairly detailed analysis of the prevalent Time-doctrine. Briefly, it is the power of commanding a vista as wide as the whole contemporary world, which makes this book worth reading. Unjust as Lewis's analysis may be in the case of particular philosophers and writers of fiction, the upshot of his remarks on the social effects of (correct or wrong) interpretations of philosophic creeds, cannot be disputed. Propaganda for the

intuitional, mystical chaos is the dragon he intends to kill, and, in this respect, this book is very nearly a mortal blow.

Lewis's analysis of works of fiction in *Time and Western Man* is only surpassed by the corresponding part in *Paleface*: of course, D. H. Lawrence and Sherwood Anderson, both bent on harnessing white man with an 'inferiority complex', offer a much easier target than either Marcel Proust or James Joyce. It is curious to compare Lewis's strictures on Joyce's study of Mr. Bloom in *Ulysses* (p. 117 ff.: ".....there is no sign throughout the book that he has ever directly and intelligently observed any *individual Jew*") with the praising remarks on the same character by a Jewish critic, Jean de Menasce (in *Revue Juive*, Année I, no. 6, November 1925): "Bloom est un juif typique..... il l'est d'une façon unique et irréparable par le schème de sa rêverie. Il ne pense pas à des choses juives, il pense juif....."

While Lewis's survey of contemporary social tendencies is, in the main, reliable enough, I do not feel so confident about his attempt at representing the Elizabethan age under the spell of Machiavelli, in *The Lion and the Fox*.¹⁾ First of all this work is full of digressions and repetitions which weaken the whole effect considerably. One wonders at times whether the author has taken the trouble of reading at least twice the page he had written. Take for instance p. 53, and see whether the two following passages ought not to have merged in one:

- I. Italy is so 'artistic', and so full of museums, of renaissance pictures and beautiful buildings, that it is usually forgotten how much more scientific and commercial the renaissance Italians were than 'artistic' even.
- II. The magnificent display of plastic and pictorial art of renaissance Italy has dazzled the senses so much that the western mind is apt to forget the general truth of how much science there is in the first place in the arts of architecture, painting and sculpture; and so, how the Italian population of the time was pre-eminently practical, commercial, scientific.

The second sentence does little more than echo the first, as it happens in extemporised eloquence. Or did Wyndham Lewis aim — which I hesitate to believe — at getting a Gertrude Stein effect? This assumption may appear not so extravagant, if one is reminded how Lewis on p. 46 of *The Lion and the Fox* speaks of "the harsh emptiness of Michelangelo's statues", and on p. 395 of *Time and Western Man* wants "the stormy grandeur of the geni in the Sistine [*sic*] Ceiling" to be a part of his idea of a concrete God.

Haste is the besetting sin of *The Lion and the Fox*: hence its lack of unity. Another serious blemish is the lack of direct study of many of the facts taken as bases of the demonstration. Here Lewis exploits the conclusions of some treatise of economic history, there Müntz supplies him with interpretations of renaissance art, a little later Villari is Lewis's source, then, of course, comes the inevitable moment in which Frazer's *Golden Bough* is laid under contribution, and the no less inevitable one in which Freud is drawn upon, thus:

- P. 110: *Pen, Pencil and Poison* is a sort of philosophy for a 'gentleman' of the childish criminal cult that may really be traceable to a fright England received in her intellectual infancy, from Machiavelli's Italy.
- P. 154: The mysterious and unreasonable change occurring in the character of Cleopatra [in *Anthony and Cleopatra*], at the end, culminating in her death (although it is explained by her fear of being taken to Rome and put on exhibition), is a female self-immolation to the man-god of whom she has made a cult.

¹⁾ *The Lion and the Fox*, the rôle of the hero in the Plays of Shakespeare. London, Grant Richards, 1927, pp. 326, 16 s. net.

Between Lewis and the facts there is always some interposed person, either a Mrs. Lee (or rather Miss V. Paget, whose *nom de plume* is Vernon Lee), or Renan, or Prof. Bradley, or Matthew Arnold, or else some interposed formula, as, for instance, that so very exciting *shamanization*, which is mysteriously lurking here and there until it discloses its full meaning, for the benefit of the profane, on p. 221.

Taking information ready made, of course, saves time; but I do not think practical reasons of this kind should be suspected in Lewis. I rather think that interpretative minds, much more than original minds, stimulate his interest: he is a critics' critic, at a second (and, sometimes, even third or fourth) remove from the original author. This is to be regretted, because, when Lewis is not writing in order to clear the social atmosphere from obnoxious influences (as in *Time and Western Man*), but, rather, with a view of interpreting "the rôle of the hero in the plays of Shakespeare", he would be the better for having recourse to the primary sources. One instance only (p. 74):

The prodigious scare-cult in a more general way reached its fullest expression in Barnes' *The Devil's Charter*, "a mixture of murder, adultery, incest, homicide, fratricide and sodomy seldom surpassed". I have not read this play, but it will be observed that sodomy is there too

The passage between quotation-marks is taken from E. Meyer's book on *Machiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama* (Weimar, Felber, 1897), which has supplied Lewis with whatever information he wanted on Machiavelli as seen by the Elizabethans. One wonders how many times Lewis has dispensed with reading the actual plays, as in this case: most of the times, I should think. It was quite enough for him to know (p. 65) that the references to Machiavelli in Elizabethan literature catalogued by Mr. E. Meyer were three hundred and ninety-five: quite a lot. *His confisus*, Lewis has built his pan-Machiavellian theory of Elizabethan literature. That from Lewis's book we have to learn more than from a score of hum-drum essays and studies by professors of literature, since Lewis's is a vivid, artistic mind, makes our regret only the deeper. How much more solid his book would have been, had he taken more pains over it!

As it is, it is little more than an impressive paradox. Had an Italian been its author, I would not have hesitated to trace the work to a spirit of extreme chauvinism. "One could multiply this indebtedness of Europe to Italy indefinitely" (p. 47) — "Without Italy it is unlikely that Watts would have invented the locomotive" (p. 53). — "If it had not been for Poggio Bracciolini and the other codex-hunters, Shakespeare would not have existed as we know him" (p. 43). Without Machiavelli — this seems the upshot of Lewis's study — Elizabethan drama would hardly have existed at all. "If three hundred and ninety-five direct references can be found to Machiavelli in Elizabethan literature, it is everywhere steeped in his philosophy and what his philosophy represented".

At any rate, as T. S. Eliot has opportunely reminded us¹), "this Machiavelli is only the Machiavelli of the *Contre-Machiavel*, and not in the least the real Machiavelli, a person whom Elizabethan England was as incapable of understanding as Georgian England, or any England, is". But, even limiting thus the influence of Machiavelli, let us remember what the most learned of living Italian critics, Farinelli, has written on the point, in his review of

¹) *Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca*. An Address read before the Shakespeare Association, 18th March, 1927. London, Milford, 1927.

Lewis Einstein's *Italian Renaissance in England* (*Giornale storico della Letteratura italiana*, vol. XLIII, 1904, p. 385): "It is folly (*è follia*) to set down always to Machiavelli the tricks and guiles, the disguises under the cloak of virtue staged by the dramatists". Of such a folly, Lewis has given a paramount instance in his book. In the same way as for an emblematicist, Mr. H. Green, Shakespeare was all emblems, so for Lewis Shakespeare's central theme is the battle of the lion and the fox: *Simpleton v. Machiavel*. "The figure of the lion and the fox is constantly present to the imagination of the poet, and recurs incessantly in his plays". (p. 177). But surely that battle is as old as humanity, and Machiavelli's maxim on the lion and the fox was current in classical antiquity. Had the Elizabethans to hear of Machiavelli in order to be aware of the most common of human contrasts? At the utmost, Machiavelli was responsible for occasional interpretations of the fox-motif.

Take the case of *Othello* (p. 190). Lewis's version of *Othello* is, briefly, an embodiment of the lion v. fox theme, where Iago is a variety of the recognized stage Machiavelli type. Lewis is not the first to see Iago in this light: this is, rather, the current interpretation of that character, contradicted only by isolated critics like Prof. Bradley. When, however, we read the source of that tragedy, Giraldis Cinthio's seventh *novella* in the third Decade of the *Hecatommithi*, we can hardly fail to notice how much more Machiavellian Giraldis's *alfiero* is than his English counterpart, Iago. The ensign is described by Giraldis as a man "*della più scelerata natura*", who "*quantunque fosse di vilissimo animo, copriva nondimeno coll'alte, et superbe parole, et colla sua presenza, di modo la viltà, ch'egli chiudeva nel cuore, che si scopriva nella sembianza un Hettore od uno Achille*." This knave, disregarding the faith pledged to his own wife (who is described here as a *bella et honesta giovane*), and the friendship and obligation towards the Moor, falls violently in love with Desdemona and, when he sees that his wooing is all in vain, plots the revenge. Giraldis's ensign cannot justify his behaviour through any provocation or slight suffered at the hands of the Moor; he is the ideal villain, who, finding obstacles in the way of his perverse will, seeks revenge through deceit and treachery. But Shakespeare's Iago is incensed by the public report that Othello has cuckolded him. "The ostensible plot of the play" — in the words of Lewis — "is really the revenge of the sex-vanity of a subordinate on his chief, the revenge taking the form of inspiring his chief with the same feelings of jealousy and wounded vanity that he has experienced himself." ¹⁾ On this account, Iago's story, as told by Shakespeare, finds parallels in many cases of retaliation instanced by Italian *novelle*, also previous to Machiavelli. Iago, an accomplished Machiavellian demon in Giraldis, becomes much more human and excusable in Shakespeare. If Shakespeare had had in his mind to make Iago conform to the Machiavelli type, he would have defeated his own end by offering a justification of Iago's monstrous revenge.

¹⁾ The reality of Iago's jealousy seems to be doubted by some commentators. The lines (Act IV, sc. 1, 46-48): "Thus credulous fools are caught: And many worthy and chaste dames even thus, All guiltless, meet reproach" — are commented upon, for instance, by H. C. Hart, in the *Arden Shakespeare*, thus: "These lines show the unreality of Iago's motives with which he formerly pretended to salve his conscience. He finds that he can ruin the happiness of innocent people. He can do it causelessly, and he is triumphant". I would not lay so much stress on those lines, since they echo almost literally the moral of Giraldis's story: "*aviene talhora che senza colpa, fedele et amorevole donna, per insidie tesele da animo malvagio, et per leggierezza di chi più crede che non bisognerebbe, da fedel marito riceve morte*."

We need not discuss Lewis's assumption that "if the Machiavel were an Englishman he would be like Falstaff" (p. 227), such a hypothesis having more the nature of a pastime than of a serious critical suggestion, but what shall we say of Lewis's Machiavellisation of Chapman? Are we to see in the Duke of Byron a Machiavel, when we know from Schoell's fundamental work on Chapman (*Etudes sur l'Humanisme continental en Angleterre*, Paris, Champion, 1926) that "*en concevant son Byron, Chapman a été littéralement hanté par l'image 'moralisée' que Plutarque lui a donnée d'Alexandre*" (p. 85), and that, if a philosopher has ever inspired Byron's words, this philosopher is Epictetus and not Machiavelli? What words of Machiavelli are to be found in Chapman's *Commonplace Book*, where he used to treasure passages of the authors who impressed him? None whatever.

The Machiavelli theory provides Lewis with one part of his contents; the other part is represented by a *shamanistic* theory of Shakespeare's personality. For Lewis, Shakespeare is a *shamanized* man or, to put it in plainer words, "he is in some powerful way feminine": "his attitude to the world is — a woman's", though Lewis does not go the length of finding in Shakespeare's plays, as he finds elsewhere, "an alexandrian effluvia [*sic*] of feminine scent" (*Time and Western Man*, p. 32). Here we are reminded of Weininger at his best and wildest, with the only difference that Weininger went a step further, since for him every Englishman partakes of the feminine nature (i.e. is *shamanized*!). Apart from the new label, this theory does not strike me as a particularly novel one: Butler's and Wilde's interpretations of the sonnets have almost exhausted our curiosity in this direction. The new appellation is, however, extremely stimulating (I am sorry to have to use again an adjective Lewis affects to dislike: see *Time and Western Man*, p. 150), no less stimulating than that word *altofronto* which recurs so many times in *The Lion and the Fox*, though I must humbly confess to be unable to attach to it any meaning whatever, unless I am to see in it a fanciful translation of English *high-brow*. The word sounds Italian (perhaps of the Italian for crossword puzzlers); and, being an Italian myself, I suppose I ought to know; however, do not ask me what is an *alto-fronto* type (p. 201, 236, 248, 256) or an *altofronto* technique (p. 254, 262). Seeing the word connected with 'gibing' (p. 248, 256), 'banter and bitterness' (245), all I can say is that, by asking me, you would drive me to a very *altofronto* mood. In *Time and Western Man* Lewis makes good fun of his former friend Ezra Pound's affectation of exotic words: *altofronto* is exactly the kind of word Pound would love, as he would love that mysterious *Atte* at p. 256, which, on closer inspection, may be explained as a contamination of a Greek *Ate* with *Attis* (Cybele's priest): in other words, *Ate shamanized*. After all, *altofronto* may only stand for something else, as, on p. 112, *Vitallezzis* is obviously meant for *Vitellozzis*, on p. 226 *male persona* stands for *mala persona*, and on p. 314 *romanorum* ought to be read *normannorum*.

I perceive that insensibly I have slipped into a strikingly Wyndham Lewis mood: that is a trick played very frequently by an author on a reviewer. This latter falls so to say under the spell of the former, and tends to mimic him. Concerning this fact Lewis ought more to rejoice than to complain, since it proves how strongly the influence of his personality can be felt. It is the power of this personality which redeems his books from their glaring defects of encyclopaedic indigestion and truculent criticism; one may even admit that those defects give piquancy to them, from a purely literary point of view, in the same way as Lewis's occasional mishandling of syntax and vocabulary adds to the vivacity of the style.

Notes and News.

Prepositional Accusative with Plain Infinitive. When reading Jack London's 'Burning Daylight' in 1917, I came across the construction quoted in E. St. VII, 144; IX, 115:

'A mangy night, but it's *my* night, you see. I'm the mangy old he-wolf. *Listen to me howl!*' And howl he did, like a lone grey timber wolf, till the Virgin thrust her pretty fingers in her ears and shivered (l. c., Tauchnitz p. 9).

At first I took 'me' for the weak form of the possessive pronoun and 'howl' for a substantive. Later on, in view of the second 'howl', I corrected this notion, guessed at a blending (*Listen to my howl (sb.)* × *Hear me howl*), and looked out for other samples of this irregular construction. I found only one more, also in an *American* writer:

And there sat Robbie, who was supposed to be the publisher; there sat Norman Hapgood, who was supposed to be editor — and *listened to old Peter lay down* the law (Upton Sinclair, *The Brass Check*, Popular Edition 25).

In German, there is a similar instance found in Goethe's letters:

ich habe . . . Stunden lang so *ihr* (i.e. der Sonne) *zugesehn hinabdämmern* (Goethe, Briefe 2; 49,4).

Herman Paul (*Deutsche Grammatik* IV, 104) calls this 'eine ungewöhnliche Fügung'; I should say, an interesting, but extremely rare analogy to the common accusative-and-infinitive after 'hören, sehen, fühlen' etc., or as Dr. Kruisinga thinks, a blending ('*ihr* zugesehn . . . × *gesehen hinabdämmern*').

The only *English* instance of 'look at' with acc. c. inf. I have come across is found in W. M. Thackeray's 'Vanity Fair', ch. XLIII (Everyman's Library p. 434):

'*Look at Glorvina enter a room*', Mrs. O'Dowd would say, 'and compare her with that poor Mrs. Osborne, who couldn't say bo to a goose'.

Here the speaker is an Irishwoman; so the construction might be an Irishism, though I have not found the identical construction in other books giving Anglo-Irish speech. No examples of *look at, listen to* + a. c. i. are quoted in O.E.D. (list², listen, look), Jamieson, Mätzner's *Middle English Dictionary*, the *English Dialect Dictionary*, and J. Zeitlin's monograph 'The Accusative with Infinitive and some kindred constructions in English' (p. 66-77).

Graz.

DR. FRITZ KARPFF.

[The material thus far available shows: 1. that the construction is undoubtedly *English* (Barbellion); 2. that it was in existence by the middle of the 19th c. (Thackeray); 3. that it seems to be fairly frequent in modern American authors (Irving Babbitt, Sandburg, London, Sinclair). More examples should be forthcoming in order to determine the exact range, and the age of the construction. — Z.]

A-Examen 1927. De *Ned. Staatscourant* van 30 en 31 Desember 1927, no. 254, bevat het verslag der commissie in 1927 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelse taal (l. o. en m. o., akte A). Wij ontlennen er de volgende opmerkingen aan betreffende het gedeelte middelbaar onderwijs:

„De schriftelijke vertaling van een stuk Nederlandsch proza in het Engelsch stelde te leur. Niet alleen het gebruik van verschillende syntactische constructies

en idiomatische uitdrukkingen, ook de vormen van werkwoorden als *to fly*, *to flee*, *to flow*, *to lead*, de vertaling van de namen van landen in Europa, de spelling van woorden als *to lose*, *leisure*, *customer*, bleken tot onverwachte moeilijkheden aanleiding te geven.

De eenigszins gewijzigde methode van examineeren in taaleigen en vaardigheid schonk bij voortduring bevrediging. De kennis van het taaleigen bleef echter over het algemeen onvoldoende. In dit opzicht stonden de kandidaten nog steeds zeer ver ten achter bij diegenen, die zich, vóór den oorlog, aan het examen onderwierpen. Vele kandidaten bleken weinig te weten van Engeland en zijn bewoners, het land van welks taal zij verondersteld werden, een grondige studie te hebben gemaakt. Zij waren niet bekend met allerlei Engelsche gewoonten, waarvan vele zich toch door karakteristieke zegswijzen in de taal zelf weerspiegelen.

De commissie van 1925 schreef in haar verslag over het examen, in dat jaar gehouden: „het komt de commissie gewenscht voor, dat de kandidaten, naast de belletristische lectuur, werken lezen van anderen aard, bij voorbeeld over Staatsinstellingen, onderwijs, rechtspraak enz. Verschillende deeltjes, uit de „Home University Library” of „The People's Books”, zullen daarbij goede diensten kunnen bewijzen. Niet alleen zal deze lectuur hun idiomatische kennis ten goede komen, doch tevens zal zij hun dat algemeene inzicht schenken in de instellingen en geschiedenis van land en volk, dat voor den toekomstigen docent van een vreemde taal van niet te onderschatten waarde is en dat de belangstelling in zijn te geven onderwijs zeer zal kunnen verhoogen.” Op dezen wensch bleken de kandidaten zeer weinig acht te hebben geslagen. Het ligt niet in de bedoeling van de commissie, dat de kandidaten op het examen komen met een opzettelijk verzameld feitenmateriaal van Engelsche letterkunde, geschiedenis en aardrijkskunde, doch iemand, die een bevoegdheid verlangt om onderwijs te geven in het Engelsch aan een middelbare school, mag niet van alle kennis op dit gebied ontbloot zijn. De onkunde in dit opzicht was inderdaad verwonderlijk: er waren kandidaten, die nooit van Byron of van Tennyson hadden gehoord, andere die Koningin Elisabeth en Koningin Victoria en de tijdperken, waarin zij leefden, steeds verwarren; volgens één candidaat was Londen de hoofdstad van Kent. Verscheidene kandidaten wisten niet, welke de drie voornaamste politieke partijen in Engeland zijn. Sommige hadden nooit een goede Engelsche courant ingezien, laat staan grondig gelezen. (Werkjes als Dean Inge's *England* en C. F. G. Masterman *The Condition of England* kunnen daarbij van veel dienst zijn).

Poëzie dienen de kandidaten degelijker te bestudeeren dan meestal bleek te zijn geschied; doen zij dat, dan zal de paraphrase op het mondeling examen hun minder zwaar vallen en zal de juiste beteekenis hun minder malen ontgaan. De bedoeling van den dichter weer te geven zal voor hen, die niet over eene voldoende vaardigheid beschikken, eene onoverkomelijke moeilijkheid blijven, doch dit bezwaar dient door een niet te kort verblijf in Engeland en zooveel mogelijk omgang met Engelschen te worden ondervangen. De commissie van 1925 heeft er in haar verslag ook op gewezen, dat aan uitspraak en vaardigheid wederom de oude eischen van vóór den wereldoorlog moesten worden gesteld. Hoewel gelukkig in de vaardigheid eenige vooruitgang viel te constateeren, konden toch tal van kandidaten bij verre na niet aan deze eischen voldoen. De meest elementaire fouten werden soms bij het spreken gemaakt, zooals: *the year shuts on the 31st of December*, *the poem goes about*, enz. Van een algemeene verbetering kon, wat de uitspraak betreft, zeer zeker niet worden gesproken. Van eene Engelsche

intonatie was vaak geen spoor te bemerken. De invloed van de moedertaal deed zich bij velen voortdurend gevoelen; er waren kandidaten, die steeds assimileerden, die in een zinsdeel als: „if this book were yours”, de *f* van *if* en de *s* van *this* stemhebbend uitspraken. De *r*, *w*, *th* (vooral ook in de verbinding *ths*) bleken groote struikelblokken. Stemhebbende slotmedeklinkers werden nu eens geheel geademd gemaakt, dan weer te gerekt uitgesproken, terwijl de tweeklanken of als gewone klinkers, of te sterk overdreven werden gehoord. De commissie is van oordeel, dat uitspraak en vaardigheid van het hoogste belang zijn en dat vooral voor een candidaat, wiens onvoldoende uitspraak zonder eenigen twijfel vast staat, de kans van slagen uiterst gering behoort te zijn.

Niettegenstaande vorige commissies er op wezen, dat verwaarloozing van de bestudeering van de regels voor de uitspraak leidde tot fouten in de practische uitspraak, bleek bij sommige kandidaten de indruk te bestaan, dat de kennis er van niet wordt vereischt.

Zoowel bij de klankleer als bij de spraakkunst ontbrak, in meerdere mate bij de vrouwelijke kandidaten, in mindere mate bij de mannelijke, een juist inzicht.

Aan het opzeggen van niet verwerkte spraakkunstregeis of niet aan eigen practijk getoetste klankvormingen hecht de commissie niet de minste waarde. Ook deze commissie wijst er wederom op, dat het voor den toekomstigen candidaat noodzakelijk is, eene behoorlijke kennis van de spraakkunst der moedertaal te bezitten, alvorens hij de theoretische studie van de vreemde taal ter hand neemt. De commissie spreekt den wensch uit, in het belang van het onderwijs, doch ook in het belang van toekomstige kandidaten, dat deze meer de aandacht zullen wijden aan hare raadgevingen dan helaas! geschonken bleek aan die van haar voorgangers.”

English Association in Holland. The programme for the Easter Session, 1928, contains the following items:

The Rev. S. E. Linley Olver, M. A., will lecture at Deventer (February 8), Amersfoort (9), Utrecht (10), Nijmegen (13), Groningen (14) and Enschede (15). Subjects: *English Village Life* and *English Cathedrals and their Builders*.

In March Dr. C. W. Kimmins will lecture at Enschede, Groningen, Haarlem, The Hague, Hilversum, Nijmegen and Utrecht; in April there will be a series of lectures by Mr. L. U. Wilkinson, M. A., to be delivered at Deventer, Enschede, Flushing, Haarlem, Hilversum and Nijmegen.

Dates and subjects of these two series will be announced to members in the usual way.

Reviews.

The Place-Names of Bedfordshire and Huntingdonshire. By A. MAWER and F. M. STENTON. (English Place-Name Society. Vol. III). Cambridge, University Press, 1926. 18 s. net.

This new volume on English place-names is extremely interesting. I can only repeat what I said about Prof. Mawer's *Place-Names and History*: England is the laboratory par excellence for toponymical research. The Introduction of the present issue of the English Place-Name Society will convince every impartial reader, not only of the positive aid which history

can expect from toponymy, but also of the negative help it affords by discarding false notions and identifications. *Bedcanford* mentioned in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle at one time with *Aylesbury*, *Bensington*, and *Eynsham* (all situated in Bedfordshire) is *not* Bedford. On the other hand, "the recorded history of the region begins with 571" in the Chronicle: archaeology proves "the intermingling of Saxon and Anglian cultures in the Ouse valley before the end of the sixth century" (p. XIII). In other words, several facts of the early history of Beds are known or can be surmised. Some of them have left traces in the place-names, others affected the local nomenclature very little indeed (*e.g.* the Scandinavian invasion of the ninth century, see p. XIX). The fact that Roman roads are still in existence or at least recognizable as such, that even old British track-ways can be detected, pertains more to the archaeological than to the toponomycal department of the historical investigation of the country. But there can be no doubt as to the importance of dates when one has to deal with the origin of names. Celtic influence either in Beds or in Hunts is still less traceable than Norse. "Place-names give no support to the theory, in itself improbable, of a long-continued British survival in the Fens." (p. XVIII). This should be borne in mind by those philologists who are always prepared to admit the survival of linguistic substrata in a given language, as for instance of a Gaulish layer in the Limburg dialect of Dutch. Messrs Mawer & Stenton have taken much pains to reconstruct the early history of both counties. In Bedfordshire an Anglian movement from the north-east and a Saxon wave from the south-west seem to have met, but the place-names concur with the historical records to suggest rather "the very gradual settlement of a tract of country" than "its rapid occupation by a large body of invaders" (p. XVI). Huntingdonshire on the contrary seems to have been settled at an earlier period. A proof of this is to be found in names as *Wintringham* and *Earith*: the latter is from OE *ear* (ON *aurr*), of doubtful meaning but "it certainly denoted in the present case the first landing place available to travellers coming up the Ouse" (p. XVII). Another instance of the same place-name is yielded by *Erith*, Kent, upon the Thames, which is certainly very old. The evidence afforded by such remarks as this emphasizes once more the extraordinary importance of all the details connected with place-names of rivers or even rivulets. Another fact of the same kind is to be found in *Gifla* (gen. plur.), name of the inhabitants of a district as recorded in the Tribal Hidage. The name is no doubt derived from the Bedfordshire river *Ivel*. Many names of rivers are still unintelligible to us, but this is not a sufficient reason why we should pay less attention to them. A common feature of the local nomenclature generally, both in England and abroad, is the nearly complete absence of any traces of heathenism. Names as *Wenslow* from *Wodneslawe* 1169 "hill or barrow . . . sacred to the worship of Woden" (p. 100) are quite exceptional. As the same fact is noticeable in Flanders, where the earliest names were used at least one hundred and fifty years before the introduction of Christianity, there can be little doubt that the heathen appearance of many names was changed purposely after the defeat of paganism. The "shyness to use the name of God" as noticed apropos of *Gadsey* (p. 63) is a cognate phenomenon, though of later date. In Flanders the place *Godverdegem* is recorded as *Hootverdegem* in 1506 and the local pronunciation is *Utverdegem*, which I am inclined to ascribe to a similar averseness to strong language (the first syllables bear great resemblance to a well-known oath: *God verd* . . .). The Flemish example shows that the tendency must not necessarily be imputed to Puritanism.

Personal names play a great part in local nomenclature and give rise to a number of questions. The Editors must be praised for their prudence in dealing with these arduous problems, though of course great difference of opinion may exist in a given case. I am not convinced that *Cæg*, *Cæga* should have anything to do with *key*, a nickname of the kind being in itself rather unlikely. As to *Cnotta* (p. 15), ON *Knútr*, etc., the original meaning was perhaps rather *knob* than *knot*. This would explain OE *cnossian*, dash, strike, *cnyssan*, beat against; and *Cnotta* as a byname would mean club or cudgel, cf. (Charles) Martel. MDU *knodde*, Du *knods*, *knots*, a cudgel, are certainly related to the English word. *Wintra* as a personal name has its correspondences in other Germanic languages. But it may be interesting to notice that another name, viz. *Windhere*, yields the same or nearly the same form at least in Old Dutch, where we find both *Winetharius* (latinized form of **Winid-harja*-) and *Wintres* (gen., in pl.-n. *Wintreshovo*). The *t* from *d* before *h* is quite normal in Dutch as in *Walterus*, *Woutra*, contrasted with OE *Waldere*. But how came a man to be called *Winter*? This too cannot be considered a natural nickname. On the authority of the pl.-n. *Wintringham*, found in different parts of England (see p. XVII) at a very early date, of *Wintrung*, personal name (Searle), it might be suggested that the *-ing* or *-ung* name is the original one, from which *Wintra* would be a derivative. This could be a mythological denomination to be compared with *Nibelung*, *Niflung*. A few place-names contain names of women, both in Beds and Hunts: as this occurs also in Worcestershire, where a still greater number of similar cases are found, it has to be considered as a specific English feature, without any correspondence among the continental Germans. Puzzling names are those containing the word *maiden*: *Medbury* is "the exact equivalent of Germ. *Magdeburg*" (p. 71). It is quite certain from some Latin translations that the popular interpretation of later days was "girls' town or place", sometimes with an unfavourable opinion about the ladies' morals (see Förstemann-Jellinghaus³ s.v. *Magathaburg*). Probably the editors are right when interpreting *Maidencote* as "dairymaids' cote"; but it is not at all certain that all the 'maiden' names should be of one origin.

As to common nouns found in place-names, few have been added to the list published in the first volume of the series (*The Chief Elements Used in English Place-Names*), which bears witness to the care with which the latter was composed. Some of the new elements are well known OE nouns, though not common in place-name nomenclature: so *mægden*, *slōh*, slough, *sulh*, furrow, *turf* (see p. 49. — The meaning of the OE word being often 'sod' or 'peat', one should inquire about the nature of the soil before translating by 'turf', i.e. grass), *gēac*, cuckoo, *hrāgra*, heron. These welcome additions to the place-name vocabulary are however less interesting than a few others of more exceptional character. There is a good deal to learn from such names as *Sawtry*, an example "of the numerous names... referring to the carriage of salt, that all-important commodity of the Middle Ages". (pag. 196). Derivatives of OE *sealt* are well known, but here we have the *sealtere* or *salter*, which is not so common. A watch-hill, OE *weard-dūn*, is still recognisable in *Old Warden*, whereas nearly the same idea is expressed by *Totternhoe* (p. 139), which is ingeniously explained as derived from OE *tōt-ærn*. The latter compound is not on actual record, but there can be very little doubt indeed as to its existence, the place suggesting by itself a 'Toot Hill' (look-out hill) and both *tōtian*, to peep out, and *ærn*, house, being well known in OE. A somewhat bolder hypothesis is the assumption of an OE adjective *trēowiht*, from *trēo*, tree, to explain *Trevor* (p. 35). The

note contributed by Prof. Ekwall, one of the numerous collaborators to the present volume, on *Pegsdon*, which is referred to *Pēaces dūn*, *pēac* representing Germanic *pauk-* (Du *pook*, dagger, *poken*, to poke, stir), will appeal to all scholars interested in etymological research. One feels tempted to ask still more and to wander from the *Peaks* to the French *pic*, a pointed summit, without forgetting the North English *pikes*... In many cases it is rather imprudent to venture on suggestions. I cannot consider the explanations given of *Clapham*, *Clophill* etc. satisfactory. The names containing the element *clap-* or *clop-* are too numerous to admit of such unnatural interpretations as 'homestead of the stumps'¹). What is the meaning of *pot* in *Potton*? A personal name is probable in *Potsgrove*, cf. *Pottingtun*, quoted by Skeat, Du *Pottingehem*. — *Herne* (p. 137) is correctly connected with the numerous Du *Haren*, but it should be observed that a common noun Du *haar*, 'height covered with wood' does not really exist. The above definition is nothing more than a guess at the original meaning, which is quite obscure.

To the list of elements found in place-names are appended (p. 284) "Notes on the distribution of these elements". The frequency of *hōh* (OE hill-spur) in Beds and comparatively in Hunts is a distinctive feature of the region. The nearly complete absence of *-ingaham* is another, whereas *stoc* is practically unknown and *þorp* little represented, though "certainly of English origin" in Beds (p. 286). The Editors generally abstain from remarks of the latter kind, most of which are premature, as the full significance of each element can only be appreciated in connection with a complete survey of the English place-name material.

As in the preceding issue a small section (p. 292 seq.) is devoted to "Field and other minor names". One feels inclined to regret that only a selection of such names has been given, for the elements found therein are not less interesting than in the other lists. This applies in the first place to the personal names. We get here new instances of English or Norse names already on record besides a few new and completely obscure formations: *Bearda*, *Brant*, *Dægel*, *Dinni* cannot be said to be of daily occurrence. Only a small number are of continental origin.

These stray remarks will show the really extraordinary interest of this new volume of the English Place-Name Society²). It is only just to point out that such a remarkable result could only be obtained with the help of quite a number of collaborators whose names fill nearly three pages of the Preface. "At the head we must place the names of Dr. Fowler and Professor Ekwall" (p. VI), the former being "the founder of the Bedfordshire Historical Record Society, who has done more than anyone else for the publication of the early records of that county" (p. V). The material execution is such as one would expect of the Cambridge University Press and the two maps at the end of the book will prove of both scientific and practical value.

Liège.

JOS. MANSION.

Arthur of Britain. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Pp. 299. London, Sidgwick & Jackson Ltd. 1927. Pr. 10/6.

If attraction always involves a risk, this may be truly said of the Arthurian problem. Here literary criticism, history and even mythology concur in

¹) Names beginning with *Clap* are known in Flanders (*Clapdorp*, *Clapschete*) and are equally obscure.

²) A new volume on Worcestershire has been published, which I hope to discuss in a further issue of this periodical.

besetting the student with their various temptations, from which he will seldom emerge without having surrendered to the airy phantasms of his own imagination. Thus doctrines have risen and decayed, now lost in the Avallon of scholarship, and there is no expectation of their resurrection. Yet many a young and promising knight will venture into the same fairy fields, again and again, and what remains of him are only the rumours of romance.

Sir Edmund Chambers is not one of these. Guided by an unfailing eye he avoids the looming illusions of theory and hypothesis, and realising with a keen perception the impossibility of arriving at a solution of the innumerable difficulties and questions presented by his subject, he contents himself with giving a statement of the case. At the same time his work is in no way a mere compilation. The writer has his own views, beliefs and convictions, but he is aware that in Arthurian criticism these are the outcome of a mental attitude and a general intuition rather than strict logical argument. He does not expect his readers to follow him blindly, nor does he force his suggestions upon their open-mindedness. All the evidence available is presented in a clear and lucid form, it is carefully weighed, and conclusions are drawn from it. But should the reader prefer to disagree as far as the latter are concerned, full liberty is left him to do so. What the writer presents in this field are hints and suggestions, no proofs. There can be no doubt that this is the right vein in which a book on the Arthurian problem must necessarily be written. One may be reluctant to recognise this, and most probably Sir Edmund Chambers has experienced a sentiment of this kind himself. What philological and historical research are aiming at, is, no doubt, something more. Yet it was wise to submit to the inevitable. By this wonderful self-restraint the writer has secured for his book an enduring and almost unique place among the literature on the subject. Students will consult it, when other works, where the final goal was perhaps more clearly sighted, will have been forgotten. And should coming generations ever succeed in attaining to the truth about Arthur, they will have to acknowledge their full indebtedness to the man who paved their way.

Here is a text-book in the true sense of the word. It contains extracts from all mediaeval records which have a bearing on Arthur of Britain, from the earliest Gallic chronicles onwards to fourteenth century histories. Thus the direct evidence may be completely viewed. Then there is a bibliographical note, which, though not exhaustive, mentions a large number of books and papers representative of Arthurian study, especially of our own time. It is preceded by a circumstantial survey of the Arthurian problem and all minor problems connected with it, in seven chapters, dealing successively with the Early Tradition, Geoffrey of Monmouth, the Sources of Geoffrey, the Acceptance of Arthur, Arthur and the Round Table, the Historicity of Arthur, Arthur and Mythology. From these titles it will appear that some of the worst puzzles of early mediaeval literature fall within the scope of this book. Thus there is the question of the compilation of the *Historia Britonum*, generally ascribed to Nennius, of Geoffrey's nationality and his Welsh, Norman and Breton connections, of the origin of the Merlin saga, of the Celtic element in the *matière de Bretagne*, of the personality of Bréri-Bleheris, and many others. In all these instances the evidence is set forth in a most unbiased manner, and the reader is left to judge for himself, although, at the same time, the writer never withholds his own views from our curiosity. As is well known, a vast amount of literature has accumulated about most of these questions within the last eighty years, so that the student would

be not a little embarrassed if he had to find his own way down to the plain facts that lie at the bottom of it all. To him it is no small gain to have at last a reliable guide by whom everything has been classified and arranged for his benefit. In fact, there is no better introduction to Arthurian study than this book.

Sir Edmund Chambers professes a certain reluctance to attribute too large a share, both in Geoffrey's *Historia Regum Britanniae* and in Arthurian romance, to Celtic tradition. However, when he claims Dr. Douglas Bruce for a partner in this respect, he does not do himself justice. With the latter there is an outspoken tendency to deny Celtic influence even where it is supported by the evidence of the facts; Sir Edmund Chambers is candidly impartial. Yet here is the point where opposition from the side of Celticists would, no doubt, be justified. Waiving Geoffrey's imaginative faculty and the French poets' wanton inspiration, an enormous amount of subject-matter remains that can only be understood from the Celtic view-point. Of course, it is but natural for one who is not a Celtic scholar to question the authenticity of the numerous Celtic traditions, assumed by critics in order to account for certain episodes in the *Historia* or the romances, although they never came down to us. To one familiar with Celtic, especially Welsh, literature and its transmission no particular boldness is needed to justify this method. What we have of Welsh prose tales in the *Mabinogion* or of romantic poetry in the *Black Book* and a few other manuscripts are only scanty *débris*. This is amply proved by the numerous allusions to unknown traditions in a story like *Kulhwch and Olwen* or the triads, and even by modern folklore. It has become customary to look upon Geoffrey more or less as an impostor. He would be so in our own days. But as a mediaeval historian he belongs to a type that was not uncommon; it has an even more brilliant representative in his Danish counterpart, Saxo Grammaticus. Whenever historical matter was failing, the gaps were filled up from current literary tradition. In a number of cases, as in the Story of King Leir, the source whence Geoffrey drew his inspiration can be pointed out without difficulty. Why should he have followed a different method in other instances? Even so enough room is left for fantasy and free speculation. With the later romances it may be different, but for Crestien and his contemporaries a similar attitude would only be natural. Whenever Celtic literature affords parallels, it seems hypercritical to reject the fundamental genuineness of both romantic and Galfridian traditions, — not as history, but as literature. The same reasoning holds good for Walter's *liber Britannici sermonis*. This need not have been a history, but why not a collection of poetry? At any rate, there is no reason to doubt its existence. The practice followed by Geoffrey in adapting his sources to the framework of the *Historia* is quite a different problem.

On the other hand Celticists will be somewhat reserved as regards the alleged Breton influences in Geoffrey's work. For the statement that "we must think then of Geoffrey as probably rather of Breton than of Welsh blood" (p. 24) no satisfactory proof has been adduced. There may be no reason "to exclude the passage of tales to Brittany from other Celtic-speaking countries" (p. 148), but there is nothing positive in this. If it should be asked, whether Brittany, as a colony, ever developed an epic or romantic poetry of herself, one could not possibly answer in the affirmative, for nothing of the kind has come down to us, nor does later Breton poetry testify to an old tradition. Poems like the *Tristan* fragments of the *Black Book* seem an impossibility in Breton. If Brittany figures pretty often in Geoffrey's *Historia*, this is only natural, and some other neighbouring countries

share this popularity. In order to accept the Breton theory with all its consequences, one should not be too well acquainted with the Celtic field. Popular traditions, of course, were current in Brittany, but of bardic poetry or prose there is no trace.

Merlin, Sir Edmund Chambers says, is wholly a creation of Geoffrey's active brain (p. 95), and he is afraid this will be "a hard saying for many Celticists". It only depends upon what is meant by this curt statement. The writer willingly admits the existence of a prototype of Merlin the prophet in the Celtic Lailocen of the *vitae*, nor does he seem to reject a relation between the Merlin-legend and the Irish story of Suibne Gelt. What then would be Geoffrey's share in the figure of Merlin? The name, of course, for he borrowed it from the place-name *Caerfyrddin*. And, besides, the connection with Welsh history, for he elaborated his relation out of a few indications in Gildas and Nennius. If Geoffrey's contribution is limited to this, there is nothing hard to any of us in this conception of Merlin. Nothing could be more like Geoffrey. Celticists may be quite reasonable after all. And theirs can only be the final decision in matters of Arthurian criticism.

There is one more point I would not let pass without discussion. "Arthur and Mythology" as a title for a chapter arouses certain suspicions. Will the theories of Sir John Rhys and other scholars be revived once more? Fortunately the writer sticks to his natural scepticism here too. At the same time he is conscious that Arthur's exploits are not always limited to the normal range of human prowess (p. 214). There are combats with monsters and giants, and other supernatural elements. In order to explain these, nature-myths and prehistoric reminiscences are rejected. Yet a certain inclination towards mythological interpretations remains. Already in the chapter on the Sources of Geoffrey the writer recognizes in Kei and Bedwyr the sun and the lightning. In Arthur he finds the characteristics of the culture-hero. The King of the Britons was a great pig-hunter, and the pig is one of the gifts of civilization; thus here an ancient culture-myth has left its traces. One might object that Arthur never hunted the domesticated pig (!) but the wild boar, and that these hunts are manifest aetiological legends, invented for the explanation of place-names. If the *Twrch Trwyth* carries a razor, a comb and a pair of scissors, this conception is doubtless founded on what may be styled a culture-myth. But this does not stamp Arthur a culture-hero. The same notion occurs in a good many folktales, and in *Kulhwch and Olwen* it was doubtless borrowed from one of these. In fact, among the Mabinogion this story is particularly rich in similar elements, such as the performing of agricultural tasks or the finding of vessels of abundance. Culture-myths may underlie them all. In the story as we have it, however, they are mere folktale *motifs*. The storytellers who first attached one or two of them to Arthur had lost all consciousness of their original meaning. This way of embellishing historical or epical matter is typically Celtic.

Much has been published on Arthur of Britain in recent times. Both criticism and imagination have been strangely attracted by the mysterious and yet radiant figure of the champion of the Celts. Let us hope that these efforts will be continued on the lines drawn by Sir Edmund Chambers.

Utrecht.

A. G. VAN HAMEL.

The Court of Sapience. Spät-mittelenglisches allegorisch-didaktisches Visionsgedicht. Kritische Textausgabe von DR. ROBERT SPINDLER. (Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Max Förster, Heft VI) 268 pages 8°. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1927. M. 10.—.

John Page's Siege of Rouen. Kritische Textausgabe von DR. HERBERT HUSCHER. (Kölner anglistische Arbeiten, herausgegeben von Herbert Schöffler, I Band) 247 pages, 8°, including 2 maps. Leipzig, Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1927. M. 10.—.

These two books embody the results of a great amount of painstaking and devoted work. They have been elaborated on very much the same plan. Both consist of a long grammatical introduction, a critical text, notes, and a glossary. The introductions give detailed information about the MSS., their relation towards one another, and their orthographical peculiarities, the language and the date of the respective poems, metrical questions, etc.

The edition of the *Court of Sapience* was begun as early as 1907 by Dr. Jäger, who fell at Ypres in November 1914. After the war his work was completed by Dr. Spindler.

Until comparatively recently the *Court of Sapience* was ascribed to Lydgate. Prof. Schick was the first to call Lydgate's authorship in question (*Temple of Glass*, E. E. T. S. 1891, Introd. p. CX). In 1906 Jäger, Schick's pupil, tentatively suggested that the dialect of the *Court of Sapience* pointed to the North, and that the poem might be by the same author as the *Babees Book*. Jäger's surmise appears to be borne out by the results of an exhaustive inquiry into the language, the vocabulary, and the metrical peculiarities of the *Court of Sapience* on the one hand, and of the *Babees Book* on the other. The two poems agree so closely as regards dialect, and in other respects, too, there are so many points of resemblance, that Spindler's conclusion is that the two poems may be by the same author, although absolutely convincing proofs cannot be adduced (Ch. 8). He assigns the *Court of Sapience* to the N. W. Midlands (Chester), p. 73; as regards the *Babees Book*, his utterances are far less definite; he simply states that the dialect of it points to a district in the North Midlands, p. 111.

The original dialect of the *Siege of Rouen*, a very graphic account of this famous siege (1418-9) points to a district not far distant from that where the *Court of Sapience* originated. Huscher thinks the *Siege of Rouen* was composed in the boundary district between the North and the Midlands, somewhere in the West Riding of Yorkshire or the adjacent parts of the neighbouring counties, p. 107.

The editors have executed the task they had set themselves with great thoroughness and attention to detail. The texts they place before their readers will probably meet with the approval of those who hold that critical texts have a *raison d'être*.

I have never been an admirer of "doctored" texts. They are useful to the student of literature, to the man who requires a readable text. To the grammarian, however, to the student in search of grammatical facts, of syntactical material, of spellings, a critical text may be a source of annoyance. Students of Anglo-Norman who have been reduced to a state of mild despair

by Koch's edition of Chardry's poems, will realize what I mean. Little details, often extremely valuable, are apt to get obscured in a critical text. Even if there was a perfect critical text of *King Horn*, the grammarian would leave it alone, and derive his materials from Hall's edition.

A critical text can only approximately represent the original. By a process of selection it has to be built up from the versions handed down to us by the various MSS. — even though, as is usually the case, one of the texts supplies most of the material. If this process is to result in anything satisfactory, two important conditions have to be satisfied. First it must be quite certain when and where the original was produced, and secondly, every detail of the dialect spoken at the time and the place in question must be known. If the editor of a critical text can only have recourse to the language reflected in a small number of other documents supposed to have been written at the time when and the place where the text to be reconstructed is assumed to have originated, there will be too much room for guess work.

A critical text can never be considered final. After the completion of it fresh material may turn up, which may, to a certain extent, invalidate the results arrived at. This is what has actually happened in the case of the *Court of Sapience*. According to a newspaper cutting, kindly sent me by one of the editors of *English Studies*, a parchment MS. was recently discovered at Naworth Castle (the property of the Earl of Carlisle), containing 321 verses of the *Court of Sapience*. In this fragment there are twelve lines and an epilogue not found in any other MS.

The editor of a critical text must come up to very high requirements. His knowledge of the various stages and dialects of the language in which the text he has chosen is written, must be so thorough, and his reading must be so extensive that he does not run the risk of making glaring blunders.

If the editor of the *Court of Sapience* had been well-read in late Middle English and early Modern English, he would probably have thought twice before he rejected the reading *chene* in l. 1614 as "nicht angängig". Lines 1611 ff. run as follows in the critical text:

Than found Plato the lady Racionall,
Whyche, whan that kynde and vertues knowen bene,
Techeth yche man by reson speciall
To vnderstand the subtile art and clene
Of kynde and vertues, what the wold[ē] mene;

At the foot of the page we find, "1614 art and clene] strengthe and chene C W S." The note to 1614 (p. 229) runs as follows, "*clene* (Lesart C) ¹⁾ ist zweifellos richtig; an ne. *chain* "Kette" zu denken, ist nicht angängig; der Reim würde dann die Aussprache [t š ɛ̃ n] verlangen; ɛ̃ jedoch erst 1551, noch dazu beim Progressisten *Hart* (als erstem) bezeugt; cf. *Horn*, S. 96."

The reading adopted by the editor certainly does not make better sense than "the subtile strengthe and chene Of kynde and vertues". The reason, however, why he rejects *chene* is open to serious objection. The spelling ought to have put him on his guard. Unusual spellings, unless they are obvious scribal errors, generally mean something, and in late Middle and early Modern English they mostly mean a great deal. The spelling *chene* is fairly frequent in Midland and Northern texts from about 1400 onwards, and undoubtedly points to the pronunciation [æ:] or [ɛ:]. I will give a few instances.

¹⁾ There must be a slip somewhere; C cannot read *chene* and *clene*.

- MS. end 14 c. Paues, *Fourteenth Century English Biblical Version* Acts 12, 6 and 7, *chenyes* (MS. N. Midl.)
- MS. beg. 15c. *St. Antony* (in *Anglia* IV) 130/13, *chenes*.
 1444. *Testamenta Eboracensia*, II, 106, *chene*.
 c. 1450. *York Plays* 316/278, *chenys*.
 bef. 1466. *Paston Letters* LXV. *chene* (twice).
- Sec. half 15 c. (?) *Ludus Coventriæ* 269/19 *chene*.
- MS. betw. 1440—94. *Promptorium Parvulorum* (Mayhew), col. 111 *chenyn* (v.) and *chenys*.
 1483. *Mann. & Househ. Exp.* 154, *schene* (O.E.D. i. v. *chain*, sb. 3)
 1501. *Bury Wills* 91, *chene*.
 1523. *Berners Froiss.* I, CCCCXXVI, 748 *chenesse* (O.E.D. i.v. *chain* sb. 6).
 1550—'63. *Machyn's Diary* pp. 32 and 221 *chenes*, p. 282 *chenne* (twice).
 1567. *Wills and Inventories* (Surtees) 266, *cheane* (note spelling!)

The spelling *chiene*, *Paston L.*, XVIII (date 1450) may mean [tʃe:n].

Let me also quote a passage from the *Siege of Rouen*, namely lines 389—392.

Thys they yssuyd	owte tho and thoo
And on the erthe	men shulde be sloo.
And othyr wer[re]	with spere and schylde
When they wolde owte	in-to the fylde.

These lines form part of a description of the fighting before Rouen. The reading "othyr werre" is most unsatisfactory; if it means anything, it must stand for "other forms of warfare". Two MSS. have *while*, another reads *whyr* (scribal error!). "And othyr while with spere and schylde" = "And sometimes with spear and shield", is undoubtedly the correct reading. *Operwhile[s]* is an ordinary Middle-English compound. — The note to l. 391 is worth quoting. "E liest *whyr*, was "schwirren, dahineilen" bedeuten könnte . . . Die Lesart *while* BM wiederum gibt keinen guten Sinn, da man aus v. 390 schwerlich schon eine Art "Kunstgriff", oder eine Kriegslist herauslesen kann. Wir konjizieren darum *werre* "Krieg", was klanglich besser ist als *were* "waren" . . . Evidently the editor cannot distinguish between *wile* and *while*. An elementary knowledge of modern English would have enabled him to avoid making this mistake.

A few more things, which I noted when going cursorily through the two books under review, may be worth mentioning.

Court of Sapience, p. 15/10. *Wolfes* may be a northern spelling rather than a scribal error. — p. 74. The spelling *june* 'join' probably has nothing to do with the northern smoothing of *i* diphthongs. In Anglo-Norman *qi* became *ui*, and this *ui* was smoothed to *u*: *joindre* > *juindre* > *jundre*, e.g. *Chanson de R.* (O), 2392, *jundes*, past part.; Philippe de Thaün, *Bestiaire*, 358 (L), *cunjunst*, pret.; *Ibid.* 1434 (L), *cunjundrunt*, fut.; *Lives Edw. the Conf.* 1939 *junture*; *Ibid.* 1973 *jundes* p.p.; Rymer, *Fœdera* I, 863, (date 1270) *jundre*. — Accordingly forms of *junen* occur in southern and midland texts just as well as in northern ones, e.g. Trevisa, *Pol.*, MS. Cott. Tib. D VII, Pfeffer § 204, *junep*, *iunede* 3 times; *Ancren Riwe*, p. 346 *on iune* (MS. T *enjunge*); *Cath. Ang.* p. 199, col. 2, *to lunge* (A, *iune*); *Iuneabyll*, *iuned*, a *iunyng* (A, *iunyng* or a *iunte*), *iunyng*, pres. part.; *Paston L.* No. 433 *juntor*, cf. *Ibid.* No. 593 *jounter*. — p. 75 bottom, and p. 76 top,

further Note 76, and Glossary i.v. *yche*. That *yche* is "typisch fürs westliche Mittelland", is hardly correct. *Ich(e)*, *ych(e)* also occurs elsewhere, for instance in *Sir Tristrem*, the *Towneley Plays*, *Amis and Amiloun*, *Statutes Norfolk Gilds* (Schultz p. 35), *Generydes*, *Ludus Coventriae*, *Coventry Corpus Christi Plays*, *Promptorium Parvulorum*, *Bokenam's Legends*, *Paston Letters* (a great many instances; 18 examples in Margaret Paston's Will, 1482), *London Documents* (Lekebusch, p. 114), *Trevisa*, *Polychronicon*, MS. Cott. Tib. D VII (Pfeffer, § 221). — p. 217, note to l. 73. The editor translates "To purpose late nothyng semed so good" by "Nichts schien jüngst so gut sich vorzunehmen als".... Evidently he takes 'to purpose' to be an infinitive, and looks upon 'good' as an adverb. 'Good', however, is always an adjective; 'to purpose', used again in the same sense in l. 88, is 'to the purpose' in modern English. The line simply means 'nothing seemed lately so good to the purpose, i.e. for the matter in hand'. — p. 229, note to l. 1448. "*was hys feete wird wohl heissen, "waren seine Füße"*". The editor suggests that 'feat' may be meant. It seems to me this gives a better reading; the word need not mean a 'tour de force', as the editor thinks; the usual meaning 'act, performance, achievement' fits in far better.

Siege of Rouen, p. 13 and p. 103. The *k* in *lykyng* has nothing to do with the question of assimilation or non-assimilation of original *k*; the O.E. word is *licung*. — p. 14. The voicing of *f* > *v*, as in *a valle* 'a fall' is not restricted to the South East. — p. 100. As regards the ending *-es* of the third person pres. ind., the author might have derived a good deal of information from Holmqvist, *On The History of the English present Inflections*, particularly *-th* and *-s*, Heidelb. 1922, Chapter VII. — p. 106. *them* is called a 'Possessivpronomen'; this is, of course, a slip. — p. 135, l. 18. "On *kynge[s]* sege" in this much emended line seems unidiomatic M. E.; the preposition should be *at*, cf. l. 33. — p. 164, lines 593—4

Thus the [pore]	pepylle spoke.
Thenn to hem thys	ij prystys toke.

According to the Introduction, p. 71, and to the variant readings given, all the MSS. have a bad rhyme here; E has *speke*: *toke*, B *spake*: *toke*, M *spake*: *take*. What the editor means by his remark respecting the reading of M "*während der Sinn der Stelle toke fordert*", I fail to see. In M l. 594 reads: "And fulle goode tente thereto was take"; the sense requires *take* (past part.). The rhyme *spoke*: *toke* adopted by the editor does not solve the difficulty satisfactorily; it is imperfect in any case, $\bar{o}$: $\bar{o}$, or rather $\bar{o}$: $\bar{u}$, if the original dialect of the poem is that of West Yorkshire. However, before *spoke* can be introduced into l. 593, it must be demonstrated that this preterite was in use in West Yorkshire about 1420. That, according to the O. E. D., it occurs from 1250 onwards, and that it is found in Langland and Malory (note, p. 71), proves nothing as regards West Yorkshire. In fact, it is highly probable, that the preterite plural was *spake* there. In the *Siege of Rouen* *spake* is found in the following rhymes, 765/6 *ye spake*: *take*; 791/2 in *blacke*: *they spake*; 1039/40 *take*: *they spake*. If the editor had sufficient reasons for rejecting the reading of M — as he evidently had — he ought to have emended the reading of E, on which his text is based. I feel tempted to suggest *spake* in line 593, and *gan take* in line 594; *prystys* should then, of course, be read as a monosyllable. — 1069/70, *ye answare* (subj.): *sore*. E has *answere*; the wording in the other MSS. is different. What has made the editor adopt the reading *answere*? Has he any authority for the $\bar{o}$? In the N. W. Midlands and the North the verb is

generally *answare*, and we have only to replace *sore* by *sare* in the next line to get a correct rhyme. The author seems to have lost sight of the fact that on p. 39 f. he mentions the preservation of OE. *ā* as an indication of the northern origin of his text, and that *care*: *sare*, 1119 f. is one of the rhymes mentioned there. — p. 222, note to l. 605. "ffor nede they muste wante mete] wörtl. "aus dem Bedürfnis heraus, dass sie Nahrung brauchten"... infolge Mangels an Nahrung. As the translation shows, the editor did not know what to make of this line; he did not see that *nede* is an adverb here. In modern English we still say, "for needs they must want food". — p. 225, note to l. 801 sad] würdevoll. 'Ernsthaft' would have been nearer the mark; cf. the modern idiom 'a *sadder* and a wiser man'. — p. 225, note to l. 833. *Strange* in the sense of 'stern', 'not friendly', 'not familiar' is not unusual in ME., and is still found in Shakespeare, as in *Jul. Caes.* I, II, 35, You beare too stubborne, and too *strange* a hand Ouer your Friend, that loues you. — p. 234, note to l. 1307. "All in raffe and not in ryme." The editor might have quoted Chaucer here: *The Parson's Prol.*, 43f.,

I can nat geste — rum, ram, ruf — by lettre;
Ne, god wot, rym holde I but litel bettre.

The Harl. MS. reads "rum, raf, ruf".

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

The Problems of the Shakespeare Sonnets. By J. M. ROBERTSON.
London, Routledge, 1926, pp. xii + 291. 15 s. net.

In any other field of human research but literature and occultism, speculations of the kind circulated by the majority of the students of the Shakespeare Sonnets would soon be attended by appropriate sanctions. Unfortunately the ways through which discredit crowns the idle work of crazy minds are much less speedy and sure in those playgrounds of pure imagination, with the result that the ground is kept cumbered with weeds which trammel the travelling foot of the newcomers. Yet literature, no less than history, is not so badly provided with safe enough tests, as to justify the survival or even the resurrection of wild hypotheses; were it not for the complacency of the critics who delight in scoring easy victories over long deceased opponents, and transform criticism into a shooting-booth decorated with many a decrepit and disreputable Aunt Sally. A good half of Mr. Robertson's book echoes with festive volleys: bang goes chalk pipe after chalk pipe: many a wooden guy is laid prostrate: Mr. Robertson beams with healthy exercise and moral satisfaction. To-morrow all the wooden guys are sure to be up again for the sport of a new visitor to this vanity fair; and, very probably, their number will have increased by one.

The spectacle is neither amusing nor edifying. Dantesque Veltroes and Beatrices, Shakespearian W. H.'s and Dark Ladies, Ur-Iliases, Ur-Hamlets, Ur-Shakespeare-Sonnets, Baconian problems and similar "inepties", as Benedetto Croce rightly termed them, would not even supply fit shows for an *Amphithéâtre des Sciences Mortes* such as Sar Merodack Josephin Péladan planned for the benefit of hysterical Sybils and decadent magicians. At their best, those curiosities could hardly provide enough somnolent attractions to flavour a treatise on *Comment on devient Idiot*, along the lines of Péladan's preposterous and little read manuals.

That Mr. Robertson is still keeping his mental faculties balanced after perusal of the stultifying literature on the Shakespeare Sonnets, is the most creditable of his achievements. Of course, he could not wade through that pestiferous swamp without catching a little malaria. There is no little risk in keeping company with such would-be literary critics as Mr. H. T. S. Forrest, or Sir Denys Bray. Mr. Forrest's "genial but arbitrary rule", as Mr. Robertson calls it, distinguishes no less than five authors of Shakespeare Sonnets (hence the title of his "large but lively quarto", published in 1923). Enough to say that Mr. Forrest ascribes to Donne the sonnets nos. 13, 15, 16, 17, whereas a Donneish flavour could be detected, if at all, in nos. 31, 32, 40, 56, 59, 76, 106, 108, 142, 146. So that Mr. Forrest's rule, without ceasing to be arbitrary, is not even genial. Why, then, take into consideration his large and lifeless quarto? "His real service" — says Mr. Robertson — "lies in his bold and indeed extravagant primary denial that the great mass of the Sonnets *can* be of Shakespeare's writing" (p. 83). He is a disintegrator, and this quality is sufficient to endear him to the leader of the school of Shakespeare's disintegrators, as Mr. Robertson has been called.

Now, in order to impeach a work correctly entered in the Stationers' Register and therefore passing, under Dr. A. W. Pollard's ruling, as a "good quarto", positive clues are required, and evidence of some kind. When no satisfactory touchstone can be produced, much better conclude with Hazlitt: "Of the Sonnets we do not well know what to say" — or, in the wise words written by Mr. Robertson himself (p. 267): "Where there is no evidence, discussion is idle".

Mr. Robertson admits that "in the Sonnets, where the fixed form, the rhymed line, the sonneting habit of phrase, set up a certain external uniformity, our clues are fewer and less obvious". "But clues they are" — he goes on — "none the less." What are they? What are the metrical and morphological tests Mr. Robertson uses? Suspicions ought to materialise into something concrete, impressions should give way to evidence. Here is a specimen of Mr. Robertson's method: "Shakespeare is not to be supposed capable of the *meretricious stuff* of No. 20, of the *fatuity* of No. 79, of the *saccharine silliness* of No. 99" etc. (p. 273: the italics are mine). Generalities; nothing to the point. Why is no. 79 to be considered a *mean and fatuous attack* on a rival, sure to be resented by any patron? (p. 225). To Mr. Robertson the lines "He lends thee virtue and he stole that word From thy behaviour" are nearly the silliest fustian in Elizabethan verse. Whatever may be our modern view of it, we may be confident enough that our view is hardly that of the Elizabethans. In the case of no. 79 Mr. Robertson's critical acumen fails him, no less than when he supports (p. 194) for no. 35 the emendation: "For to thy sensual fault I bring *incense*".¹⁾

Is no. 20 *meretricious stuff*? Mr. Pooler had already found it "not pleasing in rhythm", "differing from all other sonnets in having no single rime". Mr. Robertson, satisfied with such vague surmises, concludes triumphantly on p. 184: "no. 20 we may agree to elide as ungenueine". The true reason of Mr. Robertson's rejection of No. 20 lies elsewhere: he sees in it the most valid support of Butler's "malodorous" theory, and, ablaze with moral

¹⁾ The reading "bring in sense" corresponds very well to the punning habits of the time. A similar case of wrong emendation I came across in Miss Guiney's edition of Thomas Stanley's poems, where for the line: "When tears the subject of my tears increase", is conjectured the reading: "When *leaves*....." Fortunately in the case of Stanley's poem the question is settled by consulting its source, a sonnet by Garcilaso de la Vega, which confirms the reading: "When *tears*.....".

indignation, wants to clear Shakespeare of the taint of homosexuality. Because the recipient of no. 20 is doubtless a male, and Mr. Robertson's efforts aim at arguing female destination, whenever possible. No cavil can save no. 20: therefore no. 20 *must* be ungentle. (And then, of course, also no. 53, on the same subject.) Perhaps Mr. Robertson would have been more lenient towards that *meretricious* sonnet, had he ceased for a moment to conceive individual relation between two men in such desperately black and white terms, as to leave no alternative between conventional friendship and gross sensual commerce. Why did Chapman, who is only too often resorted to by Mr. Robertson on other occasions, let him down so badly when he could render him signal service in this case with a few lines from *Bussy's Revenge* (V, I, 184 ff.)?

But what excites the bed's desire in blood,
By no means justly can be construed love,
For when love kindles any knowing spirit,
It ends in virtue and effects divine,
And is in friendship chaste and masculine.

What else, indeed, is implied in the closing couplet of sonnet no. 20? The poet (whom Mr. Forrest identifies with Barnes, though, had he been consequent, he should have attributed the sonnet to "the Lawyer"!) applies to love the juridical distinction between *proprietas* and *usus*: "Mine be thy love, and thy love's use their [i. e. women's] treasure". Platonic love, "friendship chaste and masculine", could not be formulated in a clearer way. That this kind of love is visited by jealousy, seems to be shown by other sonnets (e. g. nos. 35, 41 and 144), but we must resist the temptation to build up a story where no more precise documents than poetical expressions are available. Actual life is richer in possible combinations than Erycius Puteanus's famous dystich on the Virgin, which could be altered in ten thousand ways; if literary theorists were only a little acquainted with mathematics, they would be simply amazed at the poverty of their imaginations in front of the wealth of possibilities. And they would realise how hopeless is the quest after the enigmatic Mr. W. H., or, at least, present their theories not as historical investigations, but in the non-committal form of more or less plausible inventions, as did Oscar Wilde. Few touches are needed, for instance, to cause Miss Stopes's theory (which Mr. Robertson adopts) to read quite like a plausible story. And a nice one, too: "The Countess of Southampton died in 1607. After winding up her affairs, her widowed husband (William Harvey) was married again in 1608, to Miss Cordelia Annesley of Lee, Kent. In the course of preparing his house to receive her, he could hardly fail to find a manuscript copy of 'Shakespeare's Sonnets' Now, as it is exceedingly probable that it was he who suggested to Shakespeare to pitch his *Sonnets* in the Arcadian key, urging the youth to matrimony, he looked at the collection with a critical eye, and thought 'these are too good to let die'. Thereupon he handed them to Thorpe and washed his hands of them . . . ' (*The Third Earl of Southampton*, p. 343—44). I confess to a partiality for the picture of the widowed husband roaming about in the empty house and finding, among dusty family papers, 'Shakespeare's Sonnets': it is so delightfully Victorian, so soothing and refreshing after Butler's sea-cook and all that "malodorous" nightmare!

Of course, the temptation to know what were in real life the vicissitudes recorded in the Sonnets is great: the more so because "the situations shadowed are unlike the conventional situations described by the tribe of sonneteers" — to repeat Walter Raleigh's words, which students of Elizabethan sonnets

cannot fail to approve. Lee's view of Shakespeare's Sonnets as literary exercises in a prevailing mode is surprising, coming as it does from one of the foremost among those students. Conventional trifles, which form the stock-in-trade of every sonneteer, the best ones not excepted, are no more common there than in Michelangelo's sonnets. The majority of those sonnets could not be classified under one or another of the well-known categories of *motifs*. Nos. 145 (properly a madrigal), 153, 154 are the most conspicuous exceptions: the last two sonnets belong to the immense tribe of derivations from the Greek epigrams. The group of the first eighteen sonnets (the "matrimonial" sonnets) is here and there not exempt from conventionalisms: such is for instance the theme of immortality secured by poetry (a theme resumed in no. 55), a Horatian commonplace to which the poets of the *Pléiade* had given wide circulation. Sonnets nos. 27, 28, 43, 61 find numberless parallels in the *canzonieri* of the Petrarchists (theme of the night apparition of the beloved one); no less do some of the sonnets dealing with the *motif* of absence (e. g. nos. 39, 43, 51), and other sonnets expounding favourite conceits: thus nos. 46, 47 (contrast between the eyes and the heart), 99 (compliments drawn from the flowers), 113 (the beloved one seen everywhere), 139 (murderous eyes — a Guarini *motif*). The group of the Dark Lady sonnets shows again a strong proportion of commonplaces. The three Will sonnets (135, 136, 143) are purposely trifles, such as even great poets did not shun to produce in those times: after all they are not more trifling than many puns in Shakespeare's comedies. That Shakespeare was actually capable of writing indifferent stuff, is shown in the sonnets delivered by the characters of *Love's Labour's Lost*.

But the peculiar fact about Shakespeare's sonnets lies in the two or three threads recurring from beginning to end; threads which we can follow up to a certain point, though the head of the skein is lost for us. Nothing like this do we experience while reading other sequels of sonnets. The average Petrarchan stuff has a *passe-partout* quality which is altogether wanting in the majority of Shakespeare's Sonnets: these latter originated from well-defined situations, their poetical sense is clear, the key to their allusions is lost. Those unique sonnets are scattered over the whole ground: occasional inferior pieces possessing the *passe-partout* quality, fall in between according to a rule of economy no less common to every book of verse than to all things in the world; since there is no light without shadow, no sound without silence, no wakeful Homer without an "aliquandiu dormitans" Homer. A book consisting solely of first-rate pieces would be anomalous, artificial, possibly the result of a selection. That natural rule of economy accounts for the inferior pieces in a better way than any possible theory of collective work. The hypothesis advanced by Mr. Robertson (p. 208-9), representing the sonnets as forming originally the contents of an album compiled by Harvey himself, cannot be maintained in front of the recurrence (admitted by Mr. Robertson) of genuine Shakespeare pieces throughout the whole collection. A supremely extravagant set of circumstances, such as no human mind can conceive, would indeed have attended the getting up of a collection, where alien sonnets by different hands should alternate with sonnets by a single author, without breaking the succession of these latter, but rather being inspired by the same circumstances. Mr. Robertson himself is well aware of the incongruities his disintegrating theory entails, since he remarks in the case of sonnets nos. 103, 105, 108 (p. 207): "To attempt to distinguish between the hands of 103, 105, 108, is to set up a fresh puzzle as to different

poets professing to be always addressing the same patron and avowing the sameness of their work."

A valuable contribution of Mr. Robertson's lies in his detection of Chapman-like elements in some of the Sonnets: particularly convincing is his analysis of sonnet 129. Chapman might have been "the rival poet", Mr. Robertson argues. That Shakespeare delighted in writing *à la manière de* someone or other among his contemporaries and predecessors, we know from the description of Priam's death in *Hamlet* (II, 2): a passage which, rather than a parody, has appeared to a recent Italian critic¹⁾ a subtle exercise or *divertissement* in bombastic style. Moreover, *A Lover's Complaint* has seemed to Mr. J. Dover Wilson (in his review of Mr. Robertson's book in *The Monthly Criterion* for August 1927) a subtle, sustained, cruel, delicious parody of Chapman's style, at least in the opening and closing stanzas. If, then, Shakespeare can be credited with subtle imitations of alien styles (even taking into no account the doubtful *Lover's Complaint*), Mr. Robertson's ascription to Chapman of some of the sonnets needs qualification. Dealing with Shakespeare, it must be kept in mind, is no less hard than dealing with Proteus. In reading Mr. Robertson's volume one gets the impression that the god must derive no little amusement from the spectacle of the man grappling with the strange shadows the god delights in assuming —

ἀργαλέος γάρ τ' ἐστὶ θεὸς βροτῶ ἀνδρὶ δαμῆναι.

Liverpool.

MARIO PRAZ.

Beiträge zur Geschichte des Geniebegriffs in England. Von HANS THÜME. (Studien zur Englischen Philologie, hrsg. von L. Morsbach und H. Hecht, LXXI). Halle, Niemeyer, 1927, pp. X + 102. M. 4.80.

Though based on standard works of previous critics (chiefly Spingarn) Dr. Thüme's is a clear, discriminating outline of the history of the idea of genius in England. Early English critics and indeed all English critics down to the XVIIIth century, have almost solely a national importance. They divulge among their countrymen ideas borrowed from the continent, i.e. from Italy, either directly or through the medium of France. Many of those ideas, anyhow, when adopted in England bear a different stress which, slight as it is at the beginning, marks, in process of time, the starting point of original developments. So the idea of free invention, the creative faculty of the poet, becomes the centre of the English *ars poetica*, chiefly through Sidney's and Bacon's writings, counteracts the universal control of rationalism in the following era, and prepares the modern development of the notion of genius. This development was greatly helped in England by the example of Shakespeare, whose work supplied a live illustration of what natural talent can do, unaided by learning (such was then, at least, the view of Shakespeare's genius). As a matter of fact it was Rymer's essay on Shakespeare which gave the sign of the opposition against classicism. The necessity of accounting for Shakespeare's work led to a broadening of the classicistic theory, and finally to its disruption: the cask proved too narrow to contain those ever-fermenting grapes. Shakespeare is the author referred to by Young in his epoch-making

¹⁾ W. Shakespeare, *Amleto*, testo riveduto, con versione a fronte, introduzione e commento a cura di Raffaello Piccoli. Firenze, Sansoni, 1927.

essay *On Original Composition*, when Young wants to show how lack of learning is to be looked upon as an advantage rather than a disparagement for a poet. With Young's writing and Gerard's *Essay on Genius* (publ. 1774) English criticism becomes of European importance. Influence of those two authors on Kant and the romantics is well-known.

In a comprehensive work like Dr. Thüme's essay, the author is not always expected to quote at first hand. Still, this common practice leads occasionally to misstatements. Thus, Dr. Thüme's reference (p. 9): "von Tasso zitiert Schelling die Aeußerung 'Keiner verdient den Namen Schöpfer ausser Gott und der Dichter' (Spingarn s. 197, Anm. 1)" is both erroneous and unsatisfactory. It is not Schelling but Shelley in his *Defence of Poetry* (quoted correctly by Spingarn) who attributes that opinion to Tasso. But neither Spingarn nor Thüme have attempted to check Shelley's reference. I wonder if somebody will try to do it some time: once in a rather hasty survey of Tasso's works I was unable to find the exact expression, but only similar ones. In another passage (p. 65), Dr. Thüme sees in Rymer's words: "A Poet is to know all Arts and Sciences", the sharpest opposition to the Renaissance theory, according to which the poetical activity (Dr. Thüme thinks) is contrasted with science. But Rymer's opinion is in accordance with what Ronsard (in his prefaces to the *Franciade*) and du Bellay (in his famous *Défense et illustration*) conceived the heroic poet to be: a sort of living encyclopaedia: "Tantôt il est philosophe, tantôt médecin, arboriste et jurisconsulte." Surely the idea of the poets of the *Pléiade* was not at variance with the humanistic ideal of omniscience.

Though Dr. Thüme does not quote it, L. P. Smith's essay on *Four romantic words* in *Words and Idioms* (London, Constable, 1925) should be read in connexion with the romantic stage of the idea of genius.

Liverpool.

MARIO PRAZ.

A Syntax of Living English. By A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VEETH. Pp. XII + 330. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Sewed f 4.90. Cloth f 5.50.

An English Grammar for Dutch Students. By E. KRUISINGA. Vol. I. A Shorter Accidence and Syntax. Fourth edition. Pp. XVI + 230. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Sewed f 3.50. Cloth f 3.90.

The appearance of a new book on English syntax, simultaneously with the fourth edition of an old one, shows that the advanced study of English in this country continues to appeal to a wide circle of readers, and that their needs are largely supplied by Dutch authors. It is also curious to note that, six years after the subject was incorporated in the curriculum of the Dutch universities, textbooks and other helps for students, scientific and educational, are still exclusively written by scholars outside the official seats of learning.

Mrs. Vechtman's *Syntax* is evidently the work of an experienced teacher. It is not, and does not claim to be, a piece of independent research, nor does it constitute a new departure in matters of theory or terminology. On the other hand, if it is not ahead of the results of modern scholarship, it is nowhere out of touch with them. Its aim is to interpret these results to students who have passed the 'primer' stage and who require a clear and reasoned survey of the subject before coming face to face with the actual

problems of syntactic investigation. It is in this intermediate stage that the method adopted is of the first importance. A book of the cram type, that only needs the insertion of questions to turn the 'rules' into a sort of grammatical catechism, can do the greatest harm, for it induces the kind of attitude that is fatal to intelligent study. The present work avoids this pitfall altogether. It makes things plain to the average pupil, without allowing him to dispense with mental effort. It also possesses the advantage of not being so perfect as to call forth implicit faith in the author's statements. The learner is left some scope to develop his critical acumen in matters of detail. I have noted a number of such cases in the margin of my copy, but no useful purpose would be served by publishing them all.

The arrangement of the subject-matter has much to recommend it. Before dealing with the parts of speech, the author discusses the sentence and, in the next chapter, word order. It is well that these should come first, instead of following by way of appendix, as in some grammars. The discussion of the *three* kinds of adjective adjuncts and clauses, restrictive, semi-adverbial and continuative, is one of a series of well-reasoned expositions. The argument is everywhere pointed by a wealth of examples, the majority of which are evidently taken from English sources, though the source is but rarely mentioned. It may perhaps be questioned whether it was necessary, in a textbook for advanced students, that nearly all these examples should be translated into Dutch. In the chapter on word order three little arrows timidly put in an appearance to indicate the intonation of pronominal questions. It is my belief that we shall see more of them in the grammars of the near future ¹⁾; they form an inevitable corollary to the use of phonetic transcription, which has already made a firm lodgment in works on English accent and syntax. The present volume, by the way, contains only isolated specimens of transcription, as in the case of [hu] for [hum]: 'sometimes *who* is also written in that case'.

Of the parts of speech, the noun is treated before the verb. As the book excludes accent, the *formation* of the genitive is not discussed; nor is the question as to what nouns can take a genitive ending. The classification of the chief relations denoted by the attributive genitive is followed by the just remark that 'the genitive does not *express* these relations; it makes it possible for these relations to be *understood*'. Remarks of this nature also occur in other parts of the book, see e.g. p. 187. — With regard to attributive nouns: does any one ever speak of *Japan towns*? (80). If so, he will have to make his reckoning with Lord Dunsany. ²⁾ — Is it true to say (p. 106, note) that '*I wish* followed by an object clause seems a unique example of a verb of full meaning having a modal function in the present tense'? I believe that *I wish* is a perfectly normal indicative; it is the verb in the object clause that has the modal function. — The chapter on *Aspect* is not, perhaps, quite satisfactory; but the same may be said of some other treatises on the subject. As long as even leading grammarians differ so widely in their notions on aspect that what one calls momentaneous, another

¹⁾ Thus, in § 202 of the present work, the even stress in groups like *running water*, as distinct from *drinking water*, is duly pointed out; but the difference in intonation is at least equally important. See a short article by L. J. Guittart in *De Drie Talen*, Aug.-Sept. 1927.

²⁾ *England Language Conditions!* in Volume XIII of the *Essays and Studies* of the English Association.

calls durative¹⁾, one can hardly look for adequate treatment in a primarily educational work like the present. The sections on the progressive form are also somewhat unequal.

Those dealing with syntactic word-groups (not ashamed of *any one seeing me, I want you to go away, longing for the music to stop*) and with verbal nouns (gerund, infinitive, but also words like *exaggeration, guidance*) are particularly good. After studying the latter, the pupil will understand that a phrase like 'this circumstance of pleasant recollection' (Mrs. Gaskell, *The Squire's Story*, Sel. Sh. Stories, I, p. 208) belongs in the same category with 'bishops of his own appointing'.²⁾ The sections on the infinitive are preceded by a two-and-a-half-page extract from one of Conan Doyle's stories; the pupil is invited to study the functions of the numerous infinitives in the piece before turning to the rules. This is not the only instance that a specimen of prose is set for analysis, either before or after a subject has been dealt with. The advantages of the method are obvious. It might have been instructive to have this chapter concluded by a comparison of the uses of the infinitive in English and Dutch, especially as regards the accusative with infinitive and the *for*-construction. — As to the absolute participle preceded by *with*, it may be observed that the same construction occurs in the case of the absolute infinitive: 'probably with a friend or two to look in occasionally from the other rooms' (Eindex. H.B.S. 1925, doubtless taken from an English book.) — It seems rather doubtful whether the *-ing* forms in 227, 2 & 4, are really present participles; on this question see now *A Shorter Accidence and Syntax*³⁾, where it has been attempted to replace the traditional distinction of the uses of the verbal derivative in *-ing* as gerund and present participle by a threefold classification of these functions as substantival, adjectival or purely verbal.

The treatment of the relatives is among the best that I remember to have seen. I may be permitted to contribute a few more specimens of the non-restrictive use of *that*, quoted from Feiling, England under the Tudors and Stuarts (Home University Library):

To her (viz. Queen Elizabeth) all the next century appealed. To restore the national equilibrium, that she maintained, was the ideal of Clarendon and Bolingbroke. (p. 86).

The Commons of these years vociferated in favour of Catherine Grey, Lady Jane's sister. But Henry VIII's will, that supported Greys against Stuarts, was itself questioned. (p. 92).

But in any case the Tudor Commonwealth, that had walked so delicately on unasked and unanswered questions of principle, mus' disappear, now that these questions were raised. (p. 127).

I believe that the term 'semi-adverbial' hardly does justice to these cases. When we substitute *which*, we are conscious of a difference: the connection between headword and clause becomes less intimate, the clause is changed into a kind of parenthetical remark from writer to reader. With *that* the clause is essential, with *which* it becomes less so. It is probably correct to say that this use of *that* is confined to clauses that occur in the body of the sentence; they cannot have end-position. The definitive formula that covers all the uses of relative *that* remains yet to be found.

¹⁾ Luick, in his review of Kruisinga's *Handbook*, Deutsche Literaturzeitung, 1927, no. 19.

²⁾ The passage in question was set for translation at last year's L. O. examination, with 'of pleasant recollection' omitted.

No doubt even the grammarian may be allowed his own personal style; yet one had perhaps better not write of 'statements which leave room for the imagination to rove' (279); nor of an action or state 'that appeals to the emotions' (139, 2a); nor again, of '... a semi-colon, which has a tendency ...' (257). — I should not have inserted a specimen like 'In such important matters one likes to choose for ourselves' (294). There is a grain of truth in the Times review of Jespersen's recent book! — Very good again is the comparative table on p. 309 of the functions of the personal pronouns of the third person, the demonstrative pronouns and the definite article.

A book like this need not strive after completeness. Yet even in the domain of syntax proper there are some notable omissions. The subjunctive is nowhere dealt with, which must be intentional; the passive construction with prepositional verbs is represented only by cases like 'The garden has been walked in', no mention being made of verbs like *to look at*, *to send for* etc. (Cf. Poutsma, II, II, ch. XLV, 24 and ch. XLVII, 30.)

As to misprints, the work contains the liberal sprinkling to which one is accustomed in English books printed in Holland — and not in books only, for that matter. Most of them are of the kind that the reader can easily correct. The following are perhaps less innocent: p. 9, l. 4 fr. b. person or *time*, read: person or *thing*. — p. 24, l. 6: beneficial *to* his country. — p. 58, l. 3, *writers'* cramp should be *writer's* cramp. — p. 60, l. 2 fr. b., read: a few dozen(s) (*of*) pens. — p. 69, l. 13 fr. b.: into *a* compound. — § 105 is missing. — p. 154, l. 2 fr. b., for *existant* read *existent*. — p. 207, l. 3: offense should be offence. — p. 291, l. 13 fr. b., for "any" read "either". — p. 317, last line, for: the *dumps*, read: the *mumps*. — The following seem rather to belong to the category of miswritings: The people in the pit — De mensen op de galerij (p. 11. l. 4 fr. b.). — Is not there something wrong about 'the youngest best man at the wedding'? (p. 58, ll. 6 & 5 fr. b.). — p. 134, l. 6 fr. b., instead of: 'noun clauses containing a verb', read: '... dependent on ...' — The use of small type is not always logical or judicious; and in at least one case the table of contents does not tally with the book itself ('Passive constructions with verbs demanding a preposition' are *not* dealt with on p. 187).

But these are details. The book as a whole, used together with some other work which includes accidence, is probably the best now available for students who have acquired the elements of grammar; and they will do well to keep it as a companion to the standard works they may consult later on. It deserves a wide circulation.

Nijmegen.

R. W. ZANDVOORT.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

Troilus and Criseyde. By GEOFFREY CHAUCER. Edited by ARUNDELL DEL RE. With Wood Engravings by ERIC GILL. 12½ × 7¾, xi. + 310 pp. Golden Cockerel Press £10 10s. n.

Lydgate's Fall of Princes. Edited by DR. HENRY BERGEN. Part. IV. Bibliographical Introduction, Notes and Glossary. 9 × 6, viii. + 529 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Milford. 1927. 15s. n.

The Temple. Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations. By GEORGE HERBERT. 10¼ × 6¼, x + 214 pp. Nonesuch Press. 31s. 6d. n.

Delighted Earth. A Selection by PETER MEADOWS from HERRICK'S "Hesperides". With Illustrations by LIONEL HELLIS. 9½ × 6, 170 pp. The Fanfrolico Press. 30s.

Annus Mirabilis. The Year of Wonders, 1666. By JOHN DRYDEN. Type-Facsimile Reprint of the First Edition, 1667. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xxiv. + 77 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 10s 6d. n.

Occasional Verses, 1702–1719. By MATTHEW PRIOR. $16 \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 6s. 6d. n.

The Poems of John Philips. Edited by M. G. LLOYD THOMAS. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, lvii. + 123 pp. Oxford: Blackwell. 1927. 8s. 6d. n. [A review will appear].

The Vanity of Human Wishes. By SAMUEL JOHNSON. $10\frac{1}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, 28 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5s. 6d. n.

Ode Occasion'd by the Death of Mr. Thomson. 1749. By WILLIAM COLLINS. $13\frac{3}{4} \times 9$, 8 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 5s. n.

Elegy Wrote in a Country Churchyard, 1751. By THOMAS GRAY. $10\frac{3}{4} \times 8\frac{1}{2}$, 11 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 3s. 6d. n.

The Three Wartons. A Choice of their Verse. Edited with a Note and a Select Bibliography by ERIC PARTRIDGE. 9×6 , 192 pp. Scholartis Press. 1927. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear].

Selected Poems. By WILLIAM BLAKE. With an Introduction by BASIL DE SELINCOURT. (World's Classics.) 6×4 ; xxvi. + 309 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. n.

The Poetry of the Age of Wordsworth. I. An Anthology of the Five Major Poets. Selected, with an Introduction, by J. DOVER WILSON. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xxiv. + 275 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1927. 7s. 6d. n.

The Complete Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Newly edited. By ROGER INGPEN and WALTER E. PECK. In ten volumes. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$. Poems: Volumes i., ii., iii., iv. Vol. iii. xi. + 352 pp. Ernest Benn. 63s. n.

The Narrative Poems of Percy Bysshe Shelley. Arranged in Chronological Order, with a Preface by C. H. HERFORD. In two volumes, $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. Vol. 1, 352 pp.; Vol. 2, 301 pp. Chatto and Windus. 12s. 6d. n. each volume.

England Reclaimed. A book of Eclogues. By OSBERT SITWELL. 9×6 , 99 pp. Duckworth. 7s. 6d. n.

A Poet's Calendar. By W. H. DAVIES. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 61 pp. Jonathan Cape. 3s. 6d. n.

Polite Conversation, in Three Dialogues. By JONATHAN SWIFT, D.D. $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, 139 pp. Elkin Mathews and Marrot. 5s. n.

The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abissinia. A Tale by SAMUEL JOHNSON. Edited by R. W. CHAPMAN. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xxi. + 227 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. n.

The Complete Works of Walter Savage Landor. Edited by T. EARLE WELBY. Vol. I–VI. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 7$. Chapman and Hall. 1927. 30s. n. each volume — in sets only.

The Works of Jane Austen (Georgian Edition). With Introductions by JOHN BAILY. Vol. 1, *Sense and Sensibility*. xv. + 561 pp. Vol. 2, *Pride and Prejudice*. xviii. + 589 pp. Vol. 3, *Mansfield Park*. xviii. + 702 pp. Vol. 4, *Emma*. xix. + 713 pp. Vol. 5, *Northanger Abbey, Persuasion, Lady Susan, The Watsons*. xviii. + 348 + xx. + 373 + xiv. $\times 195$ pp., $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Eveleigh Nash. 5s. n. each volume.

Iron and Smoke. By SHEILA KAYE-SMITH. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 316 pp. Cassell. 7s. 6d. n.

Dancing Mad. By W. H. DAVIES. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5$, 224 pp. Jonathan Cape. 1927. 6s. n.

Red Sky at Morning. By MARGARET KENNEDY. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 333 pp. Heinemann. 7s. 6s. n.

Two Forsyte Interludes: A Silent Wooing, Passers by. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$. 75 pp. Heinemann. 1s. n.

English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes. Specimens of the Pre-Elizabethan Drama. Edited, with an Introduction, Notes, and Glossary. By ALFRED W. POLLARD. (Eighth Edition, revised.) $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, lxxii. + 250 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 8s. 6d. n.

The Adventures of Five Hours. By SIR SAMUEL TUKE. With an Introduction by the REV. MONTAGUE SUMMERS. (The "Covent Garden" Series of Restoration Plays. Edited by B. VAN THAL.) 9×6 , xxxii. + 155 pp. Holden. 1927. 7s. 6d. n.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

The Story of Judith. In German and English Literature. By EDNA PURDIE. 10 × 6³/₄, 161 pp. Bangor, N. Wales: University College.

Arthur of Britain. By E. K. CHAMBERS. Pp. 299. London, Sidgwick & Jackson Ltd. 1927. 10s. 6d. net. [See Review.]

A Concordance to the Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer and to the Romaunt of the Rose. By JOHN S. P. TATLOCK and ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. 11¹/₂ × 9¹/₄, xiii. + 1,110 pp. Carnegie Institution of Washington.

The Saga and the Myth of Sir Thomas More. By R. W. CHAMBERS. 10 × 6¹/₄, 52 pp. For the British Academy. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d. n.

Die epische Technik A. Brooke's in seiner Tragical Historie of Romeus and Juliet [ihre Beziehung zu Gehalt und Form]. Von E. REDDIG. 8^o. pp. 79. Phil. Diss. Göttingen 1927.

An Introduction to the Reading of Shakespeare. By FREDERICK S. BOAS. 7¹/₂ × 5¹/₄, 112 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d.

Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca. An Address read before the Shakespeare Association, March 18, 1927. By T. S. ELIOT. 9¹/₂ × 6¹/₄, 17 pp. For the Shakespeare Association. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. net.

A Series of Papers on Shakespeare and the Theatre. Together with Papers on Edward Alleyn and Early Records Illustrating the Personal Life of Shakespeare. By MEMBERS of the SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION. 10¹/₄ × 6¹/₂, 239 pp. For the Shakespeare Association. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 16s. net.

Among these nine papers are essays by Mr. W. W. Greg on Edward Alleyn, by Mr. C. M. Haines on Shakespeare's Stagecraft, by Mr. G. E. Harrison on Shakespeare's Actors, by Dr. F. S. Boas on the Play within the Play, and by Mr. Richmond Noble on Songs and the Stage. [T.]

The Organization and Personnel of the Shakespearean Company. By THOMAS WHITFIELD BALDWIN. 9³/₄ × 6¹/₂, xii + 464 pp. Princeton University Press. London: Milford. 27s. n.

The Physical Conditions of the Elizabethan Public Playhouse. By WILLIAM J. LAWRENCE. 7³/₄ × 5¹/₄, viii + 129 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 7s. 6d. net.

Pre-Restoration Stage Studies. By WILLIAM J. LAWRENCE. 8¹/₄ × 5³/₄, ix. + 435 pp. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. London: Milford. 23s. net.

Shakespeare and "Demi-Science." Papers on Elizabethan Topics. By FELIX E. SCHELLING. 9¹/₂ × 6¹/₂, viii. + 221 pp. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. n.

Articles, reviews, and addresses, of which six are devoted to Shakespearean matters (Criticism, the Canon, the Law, the Common Folk) and others to subjects such as Ben Jonson and the Classical School, Devotional Poetry in the Reign of Charles I., the Supernatural in Old English Drama, and America's Elizabethan Heritage. [T.]

Shakespeare and the Arts. By C. H. HERFORD. 10 × 6¹/₂, 13 pp. Manchester: University Press. London: Longmans. 1s. n.

Reprinted from the *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*.

Shakespeare's Sonnets Reconsidered. By SAMUEL BUTLER. (Second Edition.) 7³/₄ × 5¹/₄. xiv. + 315 pp., and Facsimile of the Original Edition of 1609. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

Hegels Shakespeare-Interpretation. Von M. SALDITT. 4^o. VI + 46 pp. Berlin: Springer 1927. = Philos. Forschungen 5.—RM. 2.70.

Shakespeare. Die Verkörperung nordischer Schöpferkraft. Von W. MEYER—ERLACH. 8^o. pp. 63. München: Lehmann 1927. = Nordische Seher und Helden 3.—RM. 1.50.

The Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. An Attempt to determine their respective Shares and the Shares of Others. By E. H. C. OLIPHANT. 9 × 6, xvii. + 553 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 23s. n.

Thomas Randolph. By G. C. MOORE SMITH. Warton Lecture on English Poetry, 1927. 10¹/₄ × 6¹/₄, 45 pp. For the British Academy. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. n.

Milton Papers. By DAVID HARRISON STEVENS. 9¹/₂ × 7, ix. + 46 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 10s. n.

Sir Thomas Browne's Christian Morals. The Second Edition, with the Life of the Author, by SAMUEL JOHNSON. Edited with an Introduction and Notes, by S. C. ROBERTS. 7 × 4¹/₂, xix. + 219 pp. Cambridge. University Press. 6s. net.

The Gerund preceded by the Common Case.

A Study in Historical Syntax.

1. There are two constructions in English in which the gerund is preceded by the common case.

a. The day of *[this] letter writing*, only found in Middle English and Early Modern English. Here the noun is the *object* of the gerund.

b. I insist upon *Miss Sharp appearing*, found in Middle English and in Modern English. Here the noun is the *subject* of the gerund. For convenience' sake these two constructions will be referred to as type A and type B respectively.

2. The beginnings of type A are found in Old English. The simplest form of the construction is illustrated in the following quotations.

Elene 1234, Sie . . . hira dæl scired mid Marian, þe on gemynd nime
þæra deorestan dægweorðunge rode under roderum (i.e. dægweorðunge
þære deorestan rode).

Doomsday (Grein), 84, þam þe his synna nu sare geþenceþ, mod-
bysgunge micle dreoged.

Past. Care 148.6, Monig mon deð micel fæsten, ... and deð
hit for feohgitsunge.

Gregory's Dial. 72.1, seo was gelaðod . . . to cirichalgunge.

Wulfstan 277.10, ic wylle eow nu cyðan ymbe ciricmærsunge.

Laws (Thorpe) II, 288.21, Ðis is mihtiges mannes dædbotlihtinge.

Ælfric, Hom. I, 174, on dreowisan bið deofles costnung, þæt is on
tihtinge, on lustfullunge, on gedafenunge.

Id. Ibid. I, 312, seo ealde æ getacnode godspelbodunge.

Id. Ibid. I, 354, siððan ongann godspelbodung.

These combinations of noun + gerund were evidently felt to be compounds in O.E.; they were used 'ready-made', like *bear-baiting*, *house-hunting*, etc. in present-day English. None of the modern compounds, however, can, as far as I know, be traced back to O.E.

3. In Middle English the noun and the gerund sometimes are, or at any rate seem to be, less firmly cemented together than in O.E. Even in the first O.E. example given above *dæg* and *weorðunge* seem to be rather loosely connected; the genitive *þære deorestan rode* belongs to *dæg*, not to *dægweorðunge*, the meaning being 'honouring the day of the most precious cross', i.e. the day of the Invention of the Cross.

The longer one studies quotations like those given below, the more diffident one becomes as to whether in some of them the noun and the gerund form a compound or not. The greatest circumspection should be exercised in applying our modern modes of thought to the interpretation of idioms and constructions employed in bygone ages.

One thing seems certain, namely that type A constructions were freely made and used in M.E.; the principle underlying their formation is, however, the same as in O.E.

1121-2 *O.E. Chron.* (Peterb.) 1096 man þær ne gespædde butan *man myrringe and feoh spillinge*.

c. 1200 *Wohunge of ure Lauerd*, O.E.H. I, p. 283, nu beden ha mi leof . . .
Twa Bale drinch i blodleting.

- c. 1200 *Lofsong of ure Lefdi*, O.E.H. p. 205, prude and wilnunge of pris me habbed sore iwunded, asse wreððe, and onde *bac bitunge* and fikelunge.
- c. 1225 *Ancren R.* p. 82 and p. 200 *bac[k] bitunge* (This 'compound' is of frequent occurrence).
- c. 1300 *Lay F. Mass B.*, C 9., the vertus of messe *singgyng*.
- 1338 Rob. of Brunne, Chron., 4263, Of *truage askyng* he had wonder. Id., *Ibid.*, 4283, ye ne wil passe us forby Wythoute *truage askyng*.
- a. 1349 Hampole, *Pr. of Consc.*, 3610, Another (i.e. another way of delivering souls from the pains of purgatory) is here thurgh *assethe making*. Id., *Ibid.*, 3702 f., It semes þat *mes singyng* may titest þe saul out of payn bryng. Id. in *Yorksh. Wr.* I, 86, how was it þat arwenesse of *wommankynde* or *maydenhed shamyng* ne hadde þe with-drawyn.
- c. 1375 Barbour, *Bruce*, II, 143, He . . . passyt furth but *leve-taking*. Id. *Ibid.* XIII, 456 f., Thai dependit haly that day on spoulzeing and *riches taking*.
- c. 1377 *Piers Pl.*, B XIX, 71 f., Kinges come after, kneled & offred Mirre & moche golde with-outen *mercy askyng*.
- c. 1388 Chaucer, *Cant. T.*, B 2771 f., ye shal geten riches by your wit and by your travaille and to your profit, and that with-outen *wrong* or *harm-doinge* to any other persone.
- a. 1400 *Stanzaic Life of Christ*, 5825, That he thurge *aisel drynking* to þe deþ myzt soner hy
- a. 1450 Audelay, *XI Pains of Hell* (O.E. Misc.), 86, þai let oþer men of *mas hereng*. Id., *Ibid.* 139, Þese . . . neuer wold shryue hem of þat trespasse Fore dred of sklawnder and *penans doying*.
- 1449 Pecock, *Repressor*, p. 15, fleischli vse of bodies into *childe bigeting*; p. 16, Goddis trewe seruice and *lawe keping*; p. 75, we ben not neglignt but diligent . . . bi *counseil taking* of others, etc. (several more instances).
- 1464 *Paston Letters*, No. 490, Master Constantyn sewyd hym for *feyth* and *trowth brekyng*.
- 1466 *Coventry Leet B.*, p. 334, the mesures to be delyveryd . . . without *money-taking* therfor.
- 1469 *Paston Letters*, LXXX, if the tenauntes have no remedy that thei may pesibly, with ought assaught or *distresse taking*, be the seid Yelverton or his men . . . at there liberte herye there landis . . . there tyth in the feldis be lost.
- 1528 Roy and Barlowe, *Rede me*, p. 101, Is there eny grett differynge Bitwene theft and *tythe gaderynge* . . . ?
- 1553 *Respublica III*, VI, 75, ye haue but a tyme of *hay Making*.

4. In Modern English compounds like *house-hunting* can be preceded by an adjunct: How are you getting on with *your house-hunting*? — There is *some wire-pulling* going on there. — It is *the (this) organ-grinding* that upsets me. The adjunct qualifies the compound, not the first element of it. This is practically always the case in Old English too.

Ælfric, *De Novo Test.* 12.16, æt him ongann *seo godspellbodung*.

Id., *Hom.* I, 176, *nan lustfullung* ne hrepede his mod. (For further instances see section 9.)

The following quotations illustrate the same relation between the adjunct and type A in M.E.:

- c. 1200 *Lofsong of ure Lefdi*, O. E. H., I, p. 203, Ich bide þe . . . bi his *flech founge* of Pine eadie bodie.
- c. 1225 *Ancr. R.*, p. 114, hwuc was his diete þet dei *iðen ilke blodletunge*? Hwar was euer i-geuen to *eni blotletunge* so poure pitaunce? *Ibid.* p. 422, So wisliche witeð ou (= you) in *our* (= your) *blodletunge*.
- a. 1300 *N. E. Leg.* 143/94, þat was ordand for þis thing: To pay for þe *erth-out-bering*.

- end 13th c. *Tristrem* 2190 ff., Blod leten was þe king, Tristrem and þe quene;
 At her blod leteing þe flore was swopen clene.
 c. 1300 *Lay F.* Mass B., C 10, þe profet of the masse herynge.
 c. 1300 *King Alys.* 2163, Now rist grete tabour beting.
 1303 *Robert of Brunne*, *Handl. Synne*, 6906, Forþenkeþ nat of ȝoure
 almes-ȝuuyng.
 c. 1388 *Chaucer, Cant. T.*, A 2914, Heigh labour Was at the
 fyr makeing.

To these quotations the following two early Modern English ones may be added,

- 1529 *Linc. Dioc. Doc.* 150.25, And for his payne takyng to haue xxs.
 1540 *Ibid.* 233.9, And he for hys payne takyng to haue xiiij s. iiij d.

5. Legend 25 of the *North English Legendary* deals with the feast of All-Hallows. We are told it was instituted for four reasons. "þe first caus whi men wald it wirk, Was for þe halowyng of a kyrk þat first was temple for þe fendes And sethin a kyrk for goddes frendes" (p. 142, 11 ff). On the next page the poet gives an account of the consecration of this church; the first two lines are: "Bot to þe first es forto tell of þe kyrk halowyng how it befell" (143,29 f.). A comparison with the following two O.E. quotations reveals an interesting fact.

Greg. Dial. 72.3 ff., þa gelamp þære ylcan niht, þe heo sceolde on morgen to þære cyrichalgunge faran þæs foresprečenen gebedhuses, þa

Ibid. 72.15 ff., hire forbead þa þone forðgang seo sceomu to þære cyrichalgunge.

In these quotations *cyrichalgunge* does not denote the consecration of a specific church; this is particularly clear in the first, in which *cyric* is really redundant, cf. *Ibid.* 72.20 'to þære halgunge þæs gebedhuses'. The pronoun *þære* in the above quotations does not belong to *cyric*, but to *cyrichalgunge*.

In the passage from the *North English Legendary*, on the other hand, the author speaks of the consecration of a particular church, so that *þe* has a certain demonstrative force, and belongs to *kyrk*; *þe kyrk halowing* means 'þe halowyng of a kyrk þat first was temple'. Still, it should be observed again that our modern way of looking at things is not infallible, when obsolete idioms have to be interpreted. It is not impossible that to the author of the *Legendary kyrk* and *halowing* formed a real compound. How careful one has to be, is shown by the following passage from the *Ayenbite*, (p. 112): 'Hit (scil. bread) is oure, uor he hit ous let at his yleawe nymynge.' To the modern Englishman this means 'on taking his leave', but Dan Michel almost certainly meant 'at his leave-taking.'

In Middle English and early Modern English one frequently meets with instances of type A in which the adjunct appears to qualify the first element. Before making this construction the subject of further discussions, I will give the examples.

- c. 1200 *Lofsong of ure Lefdi*, O.E.H. I. p. 207, Ich bide þe bi his side openunge, bi his blodi Rune þet ron inne monie studen uest in his one hond and seodðen in his oðer, olast in his side þurlunge.
 c. 1225 *Ancr. R.*, p. 50, þe reade (scil. the red cross) limpeð to þeo þet beoð mid hore blodshedunge irudded & ireaded (= by shedding their blood).
 c. 1250 *Gen. and Exod.* 3408 ff., letro tagte him siðen witterlike Vnder him helpes oðere don, ðat folc stering to streng[t]hen on.

- a. 1300 *N. Eng. Leg.* 143.29 f., Bot to the first es forto tell *Of þe kyrk halowyng* how it befell.
- a. 1300 *Cursor Mundi* C, insertion after 17288, 89 ff., Mary maudlayn & mari iacobe And marie salome Hade boght þam oynemenz for oure lord annoyntynge.
- a. 1349 Hampole, *Yorksh. Wr.* I, 84, why wyl not myn herte breste and cleue in-two? whou schal it euere laste, whan it rennyth in myn herte at þi kyrtel-chaungynge.
- MS. c. 1400 *Lay F. Mass B.*, App. III, 68.18 f., Pat god gyfe þame grace perseverance in onest and clene relygyon kepinge.
- c. 1400 *Elucidarium* (Diss. Schmitt, 1909), p. 13, þe womman . . . leide deef before hir husbond, Pat was dampned for to moche loue schewynge to hir, & to litil to god.
- Ibid.* p. 26 (preestes) leueþ to preche good lore wiþ mouþ or bi good ensauple ȝuyynge, cf. *Ibid.* p. 29, wiþ due preching & good ensauple ȝuyynge.
- 1436 *E. E. Wills*, 107.19 f., I wolde that the prioress & the house of Chesthant haue freely theire Weddys ayen *withouten any mony payenge.*
- a. 1440 *Privy of the Passion, Yorksh. Wr.* I. 205, Thynke þe nott þat all þis Pat he suferde *with-owtynge any more doynge* one þe crosse had bene sorowe & payne Inoghe.
- 1449 *Pecock, Repressor*, p. 99, the lawe of Macomet biddeth, undir greet peyne of horrible deeth suffering, that . . .
- Id. Ibid.* p. 398, whanne that y am at the ȝeuer present in tyme of his gift making or in tyme of the gifte to me denouncing . . .
- 1450 *Paston L.* No. 132, the day of thys lettre wrytyng John Bokkyng ys com to me.
- 1455 *Ibid.*, No. 253, the Lord Cromweil wold have excused hym self of the which excuse makynge my Lord warrewikke had knolege.
- c. 1460 *Malory, Morte Darth.* 394.19, for that honour doynge to sir Tristram he was at that tyme more preysed and renouned than and he had ouerthrowen V C knyghtes.
- 1466 *Paston L.* No. 549 For x kombe malt brueng XL d.
- 1468-9 ? *Ibid.* LXXVII, For bothe ye shall loose hys good wyll and lett peraventure that advantage that he myght do yow in your lond recoveryng.
- 1471 *Rymer, Foedera* XI, 717, the King straitly chargeth and commandeth all and every of his said subgettes, that they in all wyse kepe Pease without any Quarrell making.
- 1479 *Paston L.* No. 838, To enquire who were present at hyr wylle makynge.
- 1489 *Account in Chambers, Med. Stage*, II, 363, Item payd for Arodde garment peyntynge that he went a prossasyon in xx d.
- 1504 *Account in Id. Ibid.*, II, 376, Paid for mending the garment of Jesus and the cross painting. js. iij d.
- 1509 *Will in Verney Papers*, p. 40, which two closys I wyll that my sonne John Verney have for terme off thre yeris without any thyng paynge for them.
- 1517 *Account in Feasy, Holy Week Ceremonial*, p. 198, Item for the paskayll makynge ijd.
- 1521 *Bury Wills*, p. 120 Item to Mr. Miles for the aqit̃as at thys cownt making . . . , vs. viiij d.
- 1530 *Palsgrave, Eclaircissement* (Génin), p. 408, the Gaulles suffre nothyng by this devysyon makynge.
- c. 1550 *Letters Suppression Monasteries* (Camden Soc.), CXL, sythe the tyme of his promyse makynge he ys to London.
- 1552 *Rymer, Foedera*, XV, 310, we lycence and gyve full and lawfull Powre and Authoritie to receive th' Yssues and Proffytts without any Somme of Money payng for the said Fyrst Fruyctes.
- 1553 *Roister Doister* (Arber), p. 41, The gentleman Is nowe contented that vpon your sute making, Ye be as one in election of taking.
- 1565 *Kyng Darius* 618, It shulde be hee by the noyse makynge.
- 1572 *Wills and Invent.* (Surtees), p. 383, I will that my said wife shall have my Dwelling house in Newcastle . . . without any rente paying for the same.

- a. 1575? *Gammer Gurttons Needle*, V, II, 164 f., Yea but he that made one lie *about your Cock stealing*, Wil not sticke to make another.

6. With one exception all the above quotations contain an instance of type A preceded by a preposition + adjunct, mostly a pronoun.

The origin of this construction, preposition + *pronoun* + type A is discussed by Einenkel, *Gesch. der engl. Syntax*³, p. 7. He considers the Germanic origin of it very doubtful, because so far only one O.E. example has been adduced, namely *buton ænigre are sceawunge* (Bede), a faithful imitation of the Latin *sine ullo respectu honoris*.

The passage from which Einenkel has taken his example, runs as follows:

biscopas mid folcum *buton ænigre are sceawunge* ætgædere mid iserne and lige fornumene wæron (ed. Schipper, 48. 932).

This *buton ænigre are sceawunge* would be represented in M.E. by *buten any ore shewinge*, in which *ore* would be taken for an accusative. A similar development would take place in the case of the following instances, which at the same time show that Einenkel's example is not unique.

Blickl. Hom., 161, her us manaþ & mynegaþ be þisse halgan tide weorþunga.

Greg. Dial. 17, 30, MS.O, he aforhtode þa for ðære geornfullan bene halsunge.

Ælfric, *Hom.* II, 402, aweriað eow mid þære lare fremminge.

Id. *Ibid.* II, 600, Be ðyssere tide mærsunge spræc se apostol Paulus.

Id. *Lives of S.* II, 30. 447 f., hat nu . . . me unmedemre for þære godcundran rode gretinge þa duru beon ontynede.

Hexameron 416 f., gif he syngode he wære ungesælig and syððan deadlic for ðære synne fremminge.

7. Although it cannot be denied that in a considerable number of cases the M.E. construction under discussion may have developed from an O.E. one in which the genitive did not end in -s, still there must have been other causes why it became so frequent. The O.E. combination preposition + genitive in -s + gerund cannot have been a source of it. Old English *þurh his weorces fremminge* (Ælfr. *Hom.* I, 8), *for ðæs folces hreddinge* (Id., *Ibid.* I, 240), *to heora metes tilunge* (Hexam. 286), etc. are the prototype of *for huydyng of þi lordes tresoure* (Pauves, *Fourteenth Cent. Bibl. Version*, Prol. 6.24), *for drezing of þis duel* (Will. of Pal. 919), *in stoppyng of the noyse* (Past. L. no. 7), etc.

8. Einenkel, l. c. p. 8, draws attention to the Old French construction *par la paiz fesant*, and states his opinion that there is much to justify the assumption that from the beginning of the thirteenth century the English idiom was influenced by its French parallel. Whether this influence is to be considered a factor that has to be reckoned with, can only be settled when it is proved that the French idiom was extensively used in England. Among the half dozen instances adduced by Tobler, *Vermischte Beitr. zur franz. Gramm.* I², p. 51 there is only one from an Anglo-Norman text (*Horn*, 12th century).

9. In French the idiom evidently developed spontaneously, and there is no reason why it should not have arisen spontaneously in English as well.

In Old English compounds like *godspel-bodunge* are sometimes preceded by a preposition and an adjunct in the dative, as *on ðære godspel-bodunge* (Ælfr. *Lives of S.* 112. 682), *on unclænre lust fullunge* (Anglo-Saxonica *Minora in Anglia* XI, 112.14).

The following examples are particularly interesting:

Greg. Dial. 250.27, hi . . . Þone Godes wer gesawon him befeolan
mid þære cyllfyllinge; cf. *MS.O.* *mid þære cyllan fyllinge*.
Blickl. Hom., p. 113, He þa . . . gewat from þære dustsceawunge.
Crawford Charters 9.118, ic onborgede xxx mancsa goldes to
 minre landhreddinge.

It is quite thinkable that in such constructions the noun would gradually get detached from the gerund (this seems to be confirmed by the second reading of the example from *Gregory's Dialogues*), and that the adjuncts, when the inflectional endings began to wear off, would be connected with the noun. The last of the three quotations may be compared with *in your lond recovering* (*Paston L. LXXVII*).

The next stage in the development is illustrated by a passage taken from *Homily II* (by Ælfric) in *Brotanek, Texte und Untersuchungen zur altengl. Lit. und Kirchengeschichte*, 23. 7 ff.:

Hwylcum nebbe and mid hwylcre gederftinesse derr he genealæcean
 to godes wiofude þæt he þæs haligan gerenes onfo, se þe is þurh
 his broþur hatunge swa scyldig swa se manslaga.

As this is a commentary on the text *Qui odit fratrem suum homicida est*, there is every reason to assume that *broþur* is an accusative, and that *his* does not qualify *hatunge*, but *broþur*; so that here we have the exact prototype of the construction that is so frequently met with in Middle and early Modern English.

It seems that even before the loss of inflectional endings had seriously affected adjectives and pronouns, the connection between the adjunct and the noun was felt so strongly, that the adjunct was sometimes made to agree in gender with the noun. The following two quotations point in this direction:

Ælfric, *Pastoral Letters*, 230.8, Þonne se fant-halgung beo gedon,
 Þonne rime man Pri-fealde letanian.

Id., *Ibid.*, 230.7 Þær-æfter gange se mæsse-preost to ðam fant
 halgunge mid fif-fealdum letanian.

10. Whether the noun in the type *A* construction ever occurs in the plural in O.E., is highly doubtful. It is true that in *Bede* (Schipper) 354.480 two MSS. have *in becrædinge*, while the third has *on boca rædinge* (*boca* altered from *bec*), but I agree with Onions, *Englische Studien* XLVIII. 170, that these readings "are not sufficiently well authenticated for us to make of them a foundation for a syntactical theory." — In *Greg. Dial.* 164.7 we find *fram þære boccrædinge* (MS. H. *bocrædinge*).

In Middle English the noun is frequently in the plural, while it may be preceded by a preposition or a preposition and an adjunct. There is, however, no necessity for arranging the following examples under three different headings, as it is only the circumstance that the noun is in the plural that makes them a new departure in comparison with the preceding sections.

- c. 1175 *Pater Noster*, 259 ff., vre rihte leue god came to þe þurh festing
 and þurh wacunge and ec þurh ibodenes biddunge.
- c. 1200 *Lofsung of ure Lefdi*, O.E.H., p. 207, Ich bide þe bi his
 clodes¹⁾ wrixlunge.
- c. 1200 *Orm.* 18026 f., Judea tacneþþ uss missdedess anndzætinnge.
- c. 1200 *Trin. Hom.*, p. 65, me ðingð ne brind no synful man quemere loc
 þene teares sheding.

¹⁾ This may be a genitive singular!

- c. 1250 *Bestiary* 204 ff., Go ðu ðan to godes hus ðe godspel to heren, ðat is soule drink, *sinnnes quenching*.
- c. 1300 *Havelok* 235, ther was *handes wringing*.
- c. 1300 *King Alys*. 2171, Now rist . . . *Swerdes draweyng, lymes lesyng*.
- c. 1320 Shoreham, *Poems*, 39, 1089, repentaunce hys signe also of *sennys for-ȝeuyng*.
- a. 1349 Hampole, *Pr. of Consc.* 4256, A maner (scil. of Anticrist bygynnyng) sal be, thurgh fals prechyng, Another *thurgh fals miracles shewyng*.
- c. 1377 *Piers Pl.*, B IV, 117 (= C V, 112), children *cherissyng* be chastyng (C chasted) with *ȝerdes*.
Ibid. B VII, 87, Late vsage be ȝoure solace of *seyntes lyues redyng*.
Ibid. B XIX, 373 f (= CXXII, 377 f.), Some *þorw bedes-byddyng* . . . and some *þorw penyes* (C pans) *delyng*.
- a. 1380 Wyclif, *Sel. Wks.* II, 369, Þe fourþe helpe þat Poul wischiþ, is confermyng of þe gospel, in preching and *miraclis makyng*.
- c. 1392 *Piers Pl.* C XIII, 84 *with-oute moo bedes byddyng* hus bone was vnderfonge.
- c. 1400 *Elucidarium*, p. 30, what schal antecrist doen? conferme *by myraclis shewing* al þat his disciplis haue prechid.
Ibid. p. 31, Þei preuen hem silf wiþ *deedes doynge*.
- 1424 *Paston L.* No. 4, the seyd Walter, the tyme of the seyd bylles *makyng* . . . never was seruaunt to the seyd Duc of Norfolk.
- 1451 *Linc. Dioc. Doc.* 47.28, pray for me & my wif in yer messe & in the *bedes-bedyng* on sondays.
- 1470 *Coventry Leet B.*, p. 355, Also payd for a pere *endentoures makyng* by-twix me and the sowders xxd.
- a. 1482 *Monk of Evesh.* (Arber), p. 73 And full sore . . . were the leste paynys that they then sofryd . . . for immoderate lawghyng and *ydyll wordys spekyng*.
- 1537 *Bury Wills*, p. 132, I will that she chose ij honest and just mē to be hir attorney . . . and they contentyd for *their paynes takyng*.
- 1538 *Letters Suppr. Monasteries* (Camden Soc.), p. 193, In every place ys poverty and moche schiffte made . . . as *yewellys selling* . . . But in all thes placys I have sett steys by *indentures making*.
- 1540 *Linc. Dioc. Doc.* 233.9, And he for hys payns *takyng* to haue xiij*s.* iij*d.*
- 1553 *Respublica*, III, IV, 76, harvest is not mued *withowte paines taking*.
- 1617 *Acts and Ordinances Eastland Comp.* (Camden Soc.), p. 24, every Threasurer of this Company here at London . . . shall have for his *paynes takinge* . . . The some of Fyve pounds.
- 1639 *Bury Wills*, p. 175, I will . . . a minister of the said parish of St. Maries . . . Shall haue yerely for euer twenty shillings. . . . for his and *their paines taking*.
- 1685-6 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, IV, CCCXXVI, I hear of *rare matters putting in order* in Scotland.

11. The construction illustrated in these quotations again has its parallel in Old French, *par deus cens mille mars paiant*; for further instances see Tobler, *l. c.*, p. 52. The earliest example given there (from the A.N. *Oxford Psalter*) is of about the same date as the earliest Middle English instance. It would seem, therefore, that the construction made its appearance in the two languages at the same time (in the second half of the twelfth century). This circumstance renders Anglo-Norman influence extremely doubtful.

A type A construction with the noun in the plural might easily have come into existence quite spontaneously. When the noun in such a combination as *bocræding* had become detached from the second component, nothing would be more natural than for people to pluralize it, if circumstances required this.

12. There are, however, good reasons for assuming that the *tears shedding* type is a descendant of an Old English construction.

By the side of the gerundial compound of the *bocræding* type there is

another consisting of a genitive followed by a gerund: *feos spilling* (*Chron.* 999), with which compare *feoh spillinge* (*Chron.* 1096); *be þysses dæges weorþunge* (*Blickl. Hom.* p. 133); for further instances see section 7. In this construction the noun may be plural as well as singular.

Past. Care 148.20, *ðylæs . . . se gilpna & se agita for his goda mirringe gilpe.*

Greg. Dial. 1.4 (MS. H.) *lc Ælfred . . . hæbbe . . . þurh haligra boca rædinge oft gehyred . . .*

Ibid. 215.8, *se subdeacon dyde hys sceapa gyminge.*

Blickl. Hom. p. 65, *ne þær ne biþ . . . laþra gesamnung.*

Ibid. p. 127, *þonne hangaþ þær eac . . . mycel leoftfæt . . . & bið a dæges & nihtes byrnende for þara swaþa weorþunga.*

Wulfstan, 24.20, *we gelyfað, þæt synna forgyfenes sy . . . þurh synna behreowsunge.*

Ælfric, Lives of S. 84.569, *se cuðe to-cnawan . . . be his ædrena hrepunge, hweðer he hraðe swulte.*

13. In Middle English the genitive plural of nouns soon lost its distinctive form; only in the southern dialects the ending *-ene* survived in isolated cases until a comparatively late date. Otherwise the genitive plural, even in the South, was replaced by an analytic construction — of + common case —, or if the synthetic construction was preserved, the common case took the place of the inflected form, as

Lamb. Hom. p. 103, *monies cunnes ufel; Woh. of ure Louerd*, O. E. H. I, 279 *wode wulwes wise; Trin. Hom.* p. 43 *alre wateres herde*; p. 89, *alre louverdes louverd*; p. 117, *þe apostles muðes*; p. 139 and p. 155, *mennes wuniunge*; p. 137, *alle wifes children*; *Vices and V.* 137.4, *ðrie daiȝes fare*; *Kath.* 856, *alle þeos writeres writes*; 2253, *his martirs licomes*; *Orm* 1894 and 1914, *att twenntiz daȝhess ende*; 6982 *twetȝenn daȝhess elde*; 8044, *barness þæwess*; 8494 *Cristess possitless lare*, etc. (many instances); *sunfules hele* (*Ur. God Almihti* 202).

The process is clearly illustrated in the case of a collocation that is found frequently both in Old English and in Middle English. The O.E. equivalent of *forgiveness of sins* is *synna forgif(e)nes*. (*Blickl. Hom.* p. 49 (twice), p. 87, p. 99; *Wulfst.* 24.16; *Matth.* XXVI. 28; *Mark* I. 4; *Luke* I, 77 and III, 3.) In early M.E. we find *alre sunnen forȝifenesse* (*Lamb. Hom.* 97): *to sinnes forȝiuenesse* (*Trin. Hom.* 137); *of sennes forȝevenesse* (*Rel. Ant.* I, 161; quoted by Mätzner, *Wörterb.*). Shoreham substitutes *for-ȝeuyng* for *forȝeuenesse*, hence his of *sennys for-ȝeuyng*. *Wulfstan's þurh synna behreowsunge* was no doubt *þurh sinnes bireusinge* in M.E., although I cannot adduce an instance of this; compare, however, *bireusinge of ure fule sinnes*. (*Trin. Hom.* 49), which corresponds to *hreowsunge his synna* (*Past. C.* 340.20 and 425.33). Similarly we have *forȝifnes . . . ealra synna* (*Blickl. Hom.* p. 137), which is represented in M.E. by *uorȝeuenesse of sunnen* (*Lesse Crede*, O.E. H. I, 217); *worȝiuenesse of alle þine sunnen* (*A. R.*, p. 346); *forȝifeness off sinness* (*Orm* 9194 and 9512).

This argumentation justifies the conclusion that M.E. *teares sheding*, *handes wringing*, etc. can be traced back, through a process of regular development, to an O.E. genitive plural followed by a so-called verbal noun in *-ing*, *-ung*.

14. Although a detailed treatment of the later history of the accusative + gerund lies outside the scope of this paper, I cannot refrain from giving the following interesting quotation:

- 1630 *Acts and Ordinances of the Eastland Company* (Camden Soc.), p. 62, he will . . . Deliver unto the Deputy for this Company, his severall passes, to & fro, . . . without altering figures or words blotting.

Here we find type A and its modern descendant employed in the same sentence. For a considerable time the two forms were used interchangeably. The inversion of the word order began as early as the fourteenth century; there are instances of gerund + noun in Langland, Chaucer, and Gower. It has been carried through consistently in the case of the noun being in the plural.

(To be concluded.)
Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

Poets and Wits of the Restoration.

I know he is a Devil, but he has something of the Angel yet undefac'd in him, which makes him so charming and agreeable.

Etherege, *Sir Fopling Flutter*, II, 2.

On few occasions have critics been so unanimous as in to-day's vindication of the Restoration wits. A first signal was given, I think, by the Nonesuch Press reprint of Congreve's and Wycherley's plays (1923-24), and by successful revivals of some of them on the London stage. Congreve's *Way of the World* delighted everybody. The comedy of manners seems to have entered a new period of palmy days, in the times of Aldous Huxley and the Sitwells. Last year isolated voices joined in a full choir: Etherege has found an excellent editor,¹⁾ Sedley a sympathetic biographer,²⁾ Rochester two vindicators, one in England,³⁾ the other in Germany, or rather in South Africa.⁴⁾ Such agreement of voices from various quarters is first of all an interesting indication of post-war tastes. In what epoch, indeed, would the wits and poets of the Restoration, representatives of "the kind of generation which often follows a great war" (De Sola Pinto), have been likely to find sympathetic students, if not in our days? Scepticism and sensual gratification were the characteristics of the period of relaxation which followed the stern rule of the Puritans; and, on the other hand, the literature of to-day has been recently described by Benedetto Croce⁵⁾ as "sensual, pessimistic, extoller of violence and spell-bound by it". *Inveniunt similes labra lactucas*.

Besides, that particular vindication was overdue, in order to make complete the anti-Victorian reaction, which has now reached its final stage (needless

¹⁾ *The Works of Sir George Etherege, Plays*, ed. by H. F. B. Brett-Smith. Oxford, Blackwell, 1927 (The Percy Reprints no. VI). Vol. I, pp. cviii+88; vol. II, pp. 325. Two vols. 15 s.

²⁾ *Sir Charles Sedley, 1639-1701, A Study in the Life and Literature of the Restoration*, by V. De Sola Pinto. London, Constable, 1927, pp. xii+400, with two ills. 21 s.

³⁾ *Collected Works of John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester*, ed. by John Hayward. London, The Nonesuch Press, 1926, pp. lii+408. 25 s. (out of print).

⁴⁾ *John Wilmot Earl of Rochester, his Life and Writings*, with his Lordship's private Correspondence, various other Documents, and a Bibliography of his Works and of the Literature on him. By J. Prinz. Leipzig, Mayer & Müller, 1927 (Palaestra 154), pp. 12 unnumbered + 460, with a portrait of Rochester and 16 facsimiles, price 32 M.

⁵⁾ *Contrasti d'ideali politici in Europa dopo il 1870*. Nota letta all' Accademia di scienze morali e politiche della Società Reale di Napoli. Napoli, Tipografia Sangiovanni, 1927.

to say, the pendulum of fashion is likely to swing in the opposite direction before long). One needs only to read the *epitheta ornantia* bestowed upon Rochester by the critics of last century (collected by Prinz, p. 1, footnote), or remember Macaulay's judgment of Wycherley, to feel that there is ample room for a less unfair opinion, if not actually for a whitewashing of the rakes of "the most polite" Court "that ever England saw".

None of the critics here considered, be it said to their credit, aims at a thorough whitewashing of the Restoration wits. Prinz's remark on the "futility of attempts at restoring Rochester's name to immaculate integrity" would be readily subscribed by Hayward, Brett-Smith and De Sola Pinto. All of them aim at replacing the conventional picture, based on exaggerated reports, by one which is at once more complex and truer to life. A few words of De Sola Pinto (p. 240) may be taken as a good epitome of the position of all these critics:

The recording and piecing together of a number of forgotten facts enables us, without whitewashing these *peccadilloes*, to take a more favourable view of a life which was far from wholly bad or useless. To the present writer the importance of that life seems to lie, not in the dissipation of the Restoration Court, but in the period that followed the "conversion" of 1679/80.

Accordingly, De Sola Pinto's Sedley is represented as a member of the wealthy and educated class which played an important part in building up the fine aristocratic culture of the XVIIIth century; to the shameless exhibitionist of the Cock Tavern, is contrasted the man "who could remain faithful for nineteen years to a woman to whom he was bound by no strictly legal tie, and treat her son with 'an entire, free and easie friendship' in place of the old paternal tyranny". Prinz would have us believe, on the evidence afforded by the epistolary, that Rochester was, after all, a kind-hearted, tender husband, and "who knows how he would have shaped his maturity if a longer span of life had been allotted to him?" Hayward uses very similar expressions: "Thus the humours of that unruly age became fixed on him, and posterity has unjustly caricatured him as a type of Restoration rake or scoundrel. There is nothing to be gained by attempting to scrape away this *superficial*, if unpleasant, *veneer*. We cannot remove it, but because it cannot conceal the permanent qualities of Rochester's mind, we may pierce it through and take account of what lies on the other side." Rochester has been caricatured no less than Sedley, who, according to De Sola Pinto, probably offered the prototype for the character of the wicked Baronet, so dear to the imagination of the British public in the XVIIIth and XIXth centuries.

Though these critics protest that they do not intend to whitewash their authors, and, here and there, seem to judge with the usual severity the customs of the Court, their bias is manifested by the use of such expressions as *peccadilloes* and *superficial veneer* (which I have italicised), to describe the wildest pranks of the rakes. "Taking into consideration the general softening of manners, the affair [the notorious business in the balcony of the Cock Tavern] is perhaps comparable to the more reckless 'rags' of modern students" — says De Sola Pinto (p. 59-60), and on another occasion: "The whole affair is in the style of a *fête galante* of Watteau or Fragonard." He tries, in other words, to consider Sedley's behaviour in the light Charles Lamb considered the comedy of manners: "a privation of moral light, I will call it, rather than by the ugly name of palpable darkness". But, though Sedley's life may appear to us as a comedy, or *fête galante*, we must not confuse the judgment which could be passed on such an artistic fiction of our minds, with the judgment which should be meted out to the actual life of Sedley.

Both Rochester and Sedley "converted". Failing health brought about conversion. When Rochester had been led by his priapism to the gates of death, he awoke to scruples and remorse. But, in the words of Prinz, "when the illness passed off, he no longer thought of his bodily state and resumed his former methods of wasting the reserves of strength". When ill, he argued about theology with Dr. Burnet, producing Lucretian arguments and so indulging in a sort of intellectual debauch, but when illness reached a very critical stage, he made a solemn recantation and desired the clergyman, "not without some passion", not to leave his bedside. Sir Charles Sedley's thoughts began to turn towards religion during the serious illness which followed the collapse of the tennis court in Peter Street. With health returning, a relapse into "prophanesne" followed. But a second illness in March 1686 completes the conversion, and Sir Charles seems to have gone so far, this time, as to have written an effusion in defence of the doctrines of the Church. According to the ebb and flow of health, Rochester and Sedley "sett up for good houres and sobriety" or turn to libertinage. Only Etherege remained true to the spirit of the Court of the merry monarch, and was to preserve the character of a Restoration gentleman to the end. But the only disease Etherege seems to have seriously suffered from was ague, in Ratisbon. Evidently, to bring about conversion, no less than pox was needed "*con tutte le solennità delle gomme, delle bolle, delle doglie*", to use Aretino's words. So that, all taken in, it seems to be open to doubt which of the two aspects, the licentious or the sober one, is to be considered a superficial veneer.

As for Rochester, Prinz seems to countenance Bishop Burnet's opinion that it was vicious company that debauched the precocious good-looking lad. He was made to drink because this enhanced the charms of his conversation. (As for Sedley, no solicitation of the kind was needed, since he was by nature "rhetorically drunk".) In many cases he instanced instability of purposes, restless agility, and a deep-rooted delight in mystification. Such qualities he shared with his fellow-wits. The mania of masquerading as an itinerant quack, for instance, appealed also to Buckingham, while the idea of going stark naked in public had no less fascination for Sedley, than for Rochester and Etherege. All of them possessed to a more or less eminent degree those fluid qualities which Etherege has portrayed in the characters of his masterpiece, *Sir Fopling Flutter*. Those qualities could on many occasions be construed as cruelty, malice and cowardice; but our modern critics put us on our guard against the traditional interpretation. De Sola Pinto, after having imagined Milton sitting in darkness, meditating *Paradise Lost*, being disturbed by

the sons
Of Belial, flown with insolence and wine,

concludes: "Yet the laughter of the diners at the Cock and the Rose and the very audacity of their frolics were perhaps helping to keep alive a part of England which was as valuable as the strength and steadfastness of the Puritan." Rather than as contemptible, cynical men of pleasure, they are pictured by our critics as pathetic personalities, falling victims to the "spirit of the age".

That they were weak, effeminate characters can be easily guessed from their portraits. Here is Sedley: a plump, round-faced youth, with merry black eyes, a slightly aquiline nose, full voluptuous lips, a weak chin, and an indefinable dash of drunken vacancy infused in all his features. Here is

Rochester: a handsome, extremely engaging lad, with one eye a shade smaller than the other, and an adorable pout of his sensual lips, in the delicate oval of the face. He holds gingerly in his right hand a laurel wreath over the head of a little monkey, while this pet offers to him a leaf torn from a volume. No portrait, unfortunately, is preserved of Etherege, but we hear that he was, in his person, a fair, slender, genteel man, who spoiled his countenance by drinking, and other habits of intemperance. They all delighted in finery, like the perfect *petit-maitres* they were, and kept round them pets, no less than their good-natured, indolent monarch, who took great delight in having a number of little spaniels follow him. They all were exquisitely lazy. They had sweet faces (in this, very unlike their royal master!). Also George Jeffreys (for what we can guess from the portrait in the National Gallery) had a sweet face — no matter how frequently distorted by hysterical fits of fury — with a slight cast of the left eye, like Venus. Still, notwithstanding his sweet face, and his “having no command of his tears”, he was Judge Jeffreys. One never knows what is behind a sweet effeminate face. It may well be a *fête galante* or a rag; it may as well be Bloody Assizes.

The merry thoughtless days of King Charles II, “old Rowley”, as they called him after his prolific stallion! Even a popular film on Nell Gwyn is circulating to-day throughout the world, to show us what an ideal, merry time it was! Whoever is not persuaded by the film, which I daresay is rather superficial, may consult Hamilton’s gay and genial *Mémoires de Grammont*. There he will find an enviable picture of a gallant and frivolous court, “*ce carnaval, où bien de coeurs illustres, Comme des papillons, errent en flamboyant*”. But the records of the *fête galante* are by no means contained all in Hamilton. About Rochester we find reported many a spirited escapade. Once, for instance, he and his friend Buckingham disguised themselves as inn-keepers and invited the whole countryside to frequent festivals and bouts; at last Rochester fell in love with some pretty woman, enticed her husband to get drunk in his inn and, in the meanwhile, went off to the house of the couple, disguised in woman’s clothes, this time; the unsuspecting woman took him into the house, *et caetera*, to use the refrain of one of Rochester’s songs. A rather melodramatic sequel to this anecdote is added in *Rochester’s Memoirs*: the husband, discovering what had happened during his absence, hanged himself in a fit of despair. Rochester, however, passed his fair conquest on to his friend Buckingham and, after a few days, the two noblemen sent the widow to London, with the suggestion that it was time for her to find another husband. But Prinz discredits this sequel. However, this other anecdote of the Court is well-founded: the Duke of Buckingham had an illicit amour with the wife of the Earl of Shrewsbury. When the Earl attempted to avenge the affront inflicted upon him, the Duke killed him in a duel concocted with Lady Shrewsbury, “who all that morning was trembling for her gallant, and wishing the death of her husband; and, after his fall, ’tis said the duke slept with her in his bloody shirt”. De Sola Pinto makes much of Sedley’s nineteen years’ faithfulness to Ann Ayscough, though he admits that, as regards his legitimate wife, Lady Katherine Savage, Sedley’s conduct “might have deranged the mind of a highly strung and sensitive woman with a hereditary tendency towards eccentricity”. Lady Sedley’s mania took the form of a fixed idea that she was a queen, probably, as De Sola Pinto suggests, through an identification of her own conjugal misfortunes with those of her namesake, Queen Katherine. The pathetic wife was finally

removed from her deserted house in Great Queen Street to a Ghent nunnery, where the pension paid to keep her shut in proved a great help towards establishing the prosperous state of the Abbey. If jealousy was a ludicrous sin at the court of the merry monarch, no less laughable was the incapacity of the weak to resist bullying. Dryden, wrongly surmised to be the author of a satirical attack on Rochester, was set upon and cudgelled by a pack of ruffians hired by the Earl, and became the laughing stock of the wits and gossips who did not hesitate to place their sympathies with the assailer: "Who'd be a Wit, in Dryden's cudgell'd Skin?" Also Sedley hired a ruffian to cudgel the actor Kynaston. "Black will and a cudgel" proved a popular formula, in those chivalrous and merry times. Popularity sided with the bullies: no doubt this is the reason why "chaste, pious, prudent Charles the Second" was adored by the rabble, which wept unreservedly over his death. The fine king they had lost! In order to meet his own private expenses, "old Rowley" had closed the Exchequer and appropriated about a million and a half of money, causing several great mercantile houses to break, and dismay and distress to spread through all society. In order to be able to continue his merry indolent life, he had made of England a vassal state to King Lewis of France. He bestowed much on the people who assisted him to idle time away and be merry, but he omitted to reward the old Cavaliers who had melted their plate to help his father, and, more prudently still, he omitted to pay the sailors' wages, so that, when the Dutch fleet sailed up the Medway, many English sailors could be heard on board the Dutch ships crying: "We did heretofore fight for tickets; now we fight for dollars!" When "old Rowley" died, it was rumoured that he had been poisoned with a cup of chocolate or something else: this rumour was a confirmation of his popularity, since the deaths of popular princes, especially when unexpected, were usually attributed to poison, in those merry times. "A pestilence, surpassing in horror any that during three centuries had visited the island, swept away, in six months, more than a hundred thousand human beings. And scarcely had the dead cart ceased to go its rounds, when a fire, such as had not been known in Europe since the conflagration of Rome under Nero, laid in ruins the whole city." (Macaulay) The times of "old Rowley" were merry and jolly times.

No wonder Prinz calls the Restoration "the golden age of the satirist". Though Macaulay's classical description of that age may need qualification in some details, it cannot be gainsaid as a whole; besides, far from failing to do full justice to the actual state of affairs, as Prinz maintains, the famous historian was fully aware of the political expediency of the Restoration: he warns against writers who represent it as a disastrous event. Of course Macaulay's literary judgments were not free from moral prejudice, but literary criticism was not his main job.¹⁾ It would be pleasant to consider the wits

¹⁾ Neither was history, if we agree with Lytton Strachey, who in *The Nation* for Jan. 21, 1928 (Vol. XLII, no. 16) sees in the famous historian a typical Victorian Philistine etc., as anybody knowing Lytton Strachey's fad might easily have anticipated. Particularly entertaining are Strachey's strictures on Macaulay's style: "In Macaulay's case, one cannot resist the conclusion that the absence from his make-up of intense physical emotion brought a barrenness upon his style. His sentences have no warmth and no curves; the embracing fluidity of love is lacking." I wonder whether Lytton Strachey would find more congenial the style of D'Annunzio, who writes in *La Gloria*: "Always something fleshly, something resembling a carnal violence, a mixture of atrocity and inebriation accompanies the begetting of my brain." (See my article on D'Annunzio in *The London Mercury* for February 1928).

of the Restoration as a gang of romping thoughtless children or ragging students, beyond the ethical pale, did they not themselves prevent our classifying them so by the satires they wrote on their times.

What prompted Rochester to write satires is not clear at all. Prinz, after having dismissed the hypothesis of didactic intentions, concludes that he cultivated satire for its own sake, simply because it helped him to vent his sublimated sadism. He had it in him to be what was Pietro Aretino's ambition: a scourge of princes. Whatever his motive may have been, he was recognised by Marvell as "the only man who had a true vein for satire". Now Marvell's position was clearly the position of the moralist, and to see his methods coinciding with those of the profligate courtier, tends to prove that this latter, owing to his keen sensitiveness to his environment, had more or less unawares been made an instrument, a mouthpiece of the moral indignation which rumbled behind the merry *déccr.* Rochester's was a passive, responsive nature; as his feminine agility quickly responded to vice, no less quickly did it respond to indignation, or, towards the end of his life, to religion. He was a born histrión.

His character is not the least romantic element in an age which is full of subjects for romance. So full of them, that one wonders why another Manzoni has not chosen the Restoration for a picture which, for its background, could be an English counterpart of the *Promessi Sposi*. The social conditions of Restoration England were not so different from those of Milan under the Spanish domination: also there we find lecherous Don Rodrigoes, stories of rapes and conversions, and, to round off the picture, military disasters and a terrific pestilence. There is in Dryden's *Essay of Dramatick Poesie* the narration of a river excursion down the Thames, in the direction of the bombardment, Sedley made with Dryden and two other friends, while pestilence was rife in London, which could be easily made to read like a page of Manzoni.

But De Sola Pinto, who relates that excursion (p. 89f.), did not aim at writing a romance; he has written a sound biography. Though his aim has been distinctly a vindication of Sedley, he has not let his bias distort the facts, so that the reader, while appreciating the exertions of the critic to counterbalance the traditional tale of Sedley's youthful days with a report of his parliamentary career, can form on the evidence supplied a judgment different from that of the author. Owing to this biography, our appreciation of Sedley's character will not in the future give an undue prominence to the notorious affair of the Cock Tavern, and, if it will be unable to see in him an exemplar politician (after all, he joined the opposition mainly, if not solely, because he resented the Duke of York's seducing his daughter), a model companion (his faithfulness to Ann Ayscough was evidently due largely to the decay of his sexual exuberance), or an admirable father, it will at least cease to dub him as a thoroughly bad man, in favour of a verdict of "weak". Wickedness in full swing only takes place in melodrama; in actual life very rarely is found a person so bad, that something may not be alleged to his credit, no person so ridiculous, that, from a more considerate point of view, could not be made to appear also pathetic. This latter is nearly the case of Etherege, who comes off much better in Brett-Smith's sympathetic and trustworthy introduction than in Bonamy Dobrée's lively if "somewhat journalistic" (as Brett-Smith not unwarrantably calls it¹) sketch

¹) *Essays in Biography, 1680-1726*, by B. Dobrée, Oxford University Press, 1925. See for instance a passage like this (p. 45), aiming at reproducing what crossed Etherege's mind: "... that pompous little secretary . . . what was his name? Ah yes, of course, Pepys, that was it."

of the Ratisbon sojourn. From the danger of "distortion for the purpose of art, of sacrificing the humdrum likeness for the sake of contrast", against which Dobrée warned in his preface, he has not kept free more than Lytton Strachey would have done: Dobrée conceived his essay as a picture of "a bird of paradise introduced into a rookery". But none of the other critics here in question have committed that error; rather, if they have erred at all, they have exaggerated in the opposite direction, sacrificing the ultimate significance of their authors for the sake of humdrum likeness. Because, in the history of their times, a Rochester and a Sedley did not count for their hypothetic or secretive qualities of tender husbands or good fathers; they counted and were recorded for their wild pranks. That was their contribution to the society of their time. From a biographical point of view it would be unfair to judge them only on the strength of that evidence, but from a historical and social standpoint whatever they did in private did not atone for the scandals they set up in public, unless the very extremity of those scandals should be welcomed as an element which was likely to hasten a reaction.

Hayward's introduction to his edition of the works of Rochester covers the same ground as Prinz's study. It is a pity that neither of them could avail himself of the results of the other's research. Prinz's work has been compiled far away from European libraries; therefore, as the author himself declares, it is not so complete as it should be. Considering his handicap, the results he has come to are very creditable to him. Few of the facts to which the English editor could easily have access, escape him; the most noticeable omission of the German critic consists in the date of Rochester's wedding, which is given by Hayward as January 29, 1666/67. On the other hand Prinz has sifted much more accurately the evidence at his disposal. For instance, whereas Hayward (p. xxxiii, footnote) accepts uncritically the belief that the girl who was provided for in Rochester's will was Mrs. Barry's daughter, Prinz shows that belief to be the result of a misunderstanding (p. 54). In establishing some dubious dates Prinz and Hayward are at variance: so, while the former places the episode of Miss Temple before the marriage, between 1664 and May 1665, the latter dates it after 1667 (p. xxvii). The discrepancy between the two critics is greater as to the attribution of certain poems. But before coming to this point, let us examine Hayward's edition from the point of view of textual accuracy.

As if dimly aware of his own shortcomings, Hayward has tried to obviate future strictures by declaring his edition to be "nothing more than the largest collection of Rochester's poems and letters that has yet appeared in print: in no sense a definitive edition". A good test of its reliability may be found in a comparison of the text of the letters directly reproduced from B. M. Harleian MSS. 7003 by both Hayward and Prinz. Hayward declares that "the carelessness and obvious haste with which some of them were written have made it necessary for *him* to supplement the punctuation". On the other hand Prinz claims that his edition is "a diplomatic one, preserving all the peculiarities and inconsistencies of the spelling and the punctuation of the originals". Hayward does not speak of any alteration of the spelling, but the first thing which strikes one in reading his text of the letters is the inconsistency of his method. Sometimes he modernises the spelling, sometimes he retains the old forms. For instance, p. 293, Letter LXXXII, l. 5: *it, me*, while the MS, carefully reproduced by Prinz, has *itt, mee*; but on pp. 294-95 he sometimes prints *itt, mee*. On p. 280, last line, he transcribes *gett*, but on p. 281 *peeses* is modernised into *pieces*, *shipwrack* into *shipwreck*,

and on p. 284 *Lincoln's end feild* into *Lincoln's-Inn-Fields*. Instances of this kind are numberless; but unfortunately they are neither all nor the worst which can be urged against Hayward's text. Take letter LV, p. 280 (Prinz, letter 1, p. 251). The text, reproduced correctly by Prinz, l. 5, has: *and certainly I will never bee . . .* Hayward has: *and certainly Savill [would] never bee*. That mysterious *Savill* has sprung from a misreading of a very clear *I will*; after such a prodigy of interpretation, Hayward still missed the verb, and has "supplied" it in square brackets! A few lines further he reads *the 26 of the last month as the 2nd of the last month*; *Rocks* as *Rocke*; *seene* as *scene*; *bare* as *some*; *mere* as *were*; and, in the postscript, *teeth* as *wish*. On p. 281, l. 11, he prints *and* where the text has nothing, l. 23 he supplies in square brackets *had* which is actually in the text, l. 35 he prints *not to bee [taken] for* where the text has *not to bee b[?roken] d[o]wne for* (Prinz: *not to bee [fought] downe for*), and, between ll. 20 and 21 he jumps over an entire passage. The text has: *however wee came bravely into the Harbour in the midst of the towne and Castles and there Anchored close by the Dutch men. Wee had immediately . . .* All the words between *however* and *Wee had* are missing in Hayward. I omit to mention minor inaccuracies, which teem in Hayward's text of this as well as of the following letters, and I proceed to give only a short list of the most serious blunders. Letter LIX, p. 283, l. 11: *accidentally*, MS. *immediately*; l. 15: *discussing*, MS. *discoursing*; l. 21: *Alteration*, MS. *relation*. Letter LXI, p. 284, l. 4: *small*, MS. *formall*. Letter LXXIV, p. 290, l. 4: *Coach-Horses*, MS. *Coach mares*. Letter LXXVIII, p. 291, l. 3: *vertue*, MS. *justice*. Letter LXXIX, p. 292, l. 7: *furnish [you] Coales with*, MS. *furnish you with*. Letter LXXXVII, p. 295, l. 8: *etc.*, MS. *els*; l. 20: *Mortennell*, MS. *Morton Nell*; l. 26: *St. Humphry*, MS. *Sr Humphrey*. Letter LXXXIII, p. 293, l. 6: *sweet smelling eye*, MS. *sweet & melting eye*. I do not venture to guess what idea Hayward may have formed of a *smelling eye*; I prefer to think that he, or the person employed by him to transcribe the text, was dozing while he foisted upon Rochester that *monstrum inauditum*. My surmise of an intermediate copyist arises from the transcription of letter LXX, p. 288. The MS. has: *These For the Countess of Rochester . . .* Hayward seems to be suffering from some misapprehension when he prints: (*Seal these for the Countess of Rochester . . .*). Finally, in letter LXXXVIII, p. 296, between ll. 6 and 7 another passage is omitted. The MS. has: *your Tutor, to whom I have intirely resign'd you for this seven yeare, and according . . .* All the words between *Tutor* and *according* are missing in Hayward.

The text supplied by Prinz, though not flawless (e.g. on p. 253, l. 7 he has *five shippes* instead of *fireshipps*) is perfection itself when compared with Hayward's achievement. I am sorry for the English editor, who certainly by his transcript of the letters does not give proof of his competence, for the Nonesuch Press, whose fine typographical work is marred by a corrupt text, and for the eager book-lovers who paid the double of the original price in order to secure a book which cannot be read with entire confidence.

Hayward's text of Rochester's works existing in print is fortunately more serviceable. However, errors like the following ones occurring in the original texts of the poems ought to have been corrected at least in the textual notes: p. 22, stanza 6: *Thus she whom Princes had deny'd*; *whom* should be *who*; p. 42, stanza 5: *From whose Broad-sides Volley of Wit shall rain*; rather *Volleys*; p. 84, l. 19: *She that confines her Beams to one mans fight*; read *sight*¹⁾; p. 102, l. 11 from the bottom: *Here 'tis your practice all*

¹⁾ Evidently owing to confusion of f and l.

your Art; read you practice; p. 112, l. 3 from the bottom: *K. Tullius*; read *K. Tattius*; p. 128, stanza 6: *Sussolk*; read *Suffolk*.¹⁾ Barbarous divisions of lines in *Valentinian*, occurring in the original text (even if deliberately made in view of delivery on the stage) should not have been left unnoticed. So for instance:

And Death, look throu' your Eyes — I am markt for
Slaughter, and know the telling of this Truth has made Me (p. 176).

The Curses that I owe to Enemies, ev'n those the *Sabins* sent,
When *Romulus* (as thou hast me) ravisht their noble Maids (p. 209).

Occasional errors in quoting pages in the notes: p. 331: "A Pastoral Courtship" referred to as found on p. 81, is really printed on p. 80; Scrope's answer, quoted in the second note to p. 62 (on p. 361) is printed in the Appendix on p. 313, and not on p. 304. On p. 380, note to p. 131, l. 9, read *Sandys*, not *Sondys*; on p. 381, note to p. 138, l. 7, read *ludibria*, not *ludibrig*. As for the notes themselves, one wonders what need there was of reminding the reader of the careers of such well-known historical characters as Nero, Tiberius, Caligula, Numa (p. 388), whereas the passage quoted to illustrate *Heliogabalus's Sin* (misquoted as *Heliogabalus' Sin*) (p. 370) is irrelevant; see rather Lampridii *Elagabalus*, V: "cum iniretur . . . a viris et subigeret", XXVI and *passim* (Prinz, p. 168, interprets the passage correctly.²⁾ The epigram written under Nelly's picture, on p. 120, is not recognised by Hayward as an adaptation of an obscene ditty which is common property of international erotic folklore (Prinz, p. 148). Themes which Rochester draws from the stock-in-trade of XVII cent. literature could be illustrated. Of such kind are the conceit on p. 82: "Strange when at once in one appear / All the four seasons of the year" (cp. for instance Maurizio Moro's *Giardino di Madrigali*, II, 119, "*Che sono le quattro stagioni in lei*"); and the motif of the song "Insulting Beauty, you mispend" (p. 117), which is to be traced ultimately to Ovid's *Amores* II, ix. Prinz tentatively suggests (p. 65) that "here and there . . . an echo also of Marini's flowery style is to be heard", and that "it is not unlikely that during his sojourn in Italy the Earl made the acquaintance of this poet and his school", but does nothing to confirm these hints. Prinz's knowledge of Italian must be very imperfect, if on p. 37 he could quote the well-known song from *Rigoletto*, "*La donna è mobile*", as "*Donne e mobile*". An imitation of Marino's *Amori notturni* is *The Disappointment*. Marino clearly derives from Ovid's *Amores* III, vii; but certain details in Rochester are to be paralleled only in Marino (both poems, for instance, begin with a description of the sunset and of the scene), with whom he has in common also the division into stanzas. Rochester, on the other hand, had before his eyes Ovid in *The Imperfect Enjoyment*, p. 71, as may be shown by the coincidence of certain of his expressions with the Latin text, and not with the Italian (e.g. p. 72, l. 4 from the bottom: *worst part of me . . .* Ovid, cit., l. 69: *pars pessima nostri*; Marino: *parte vile insensata*). A similar situation is also described in Petronius's *Satyricon*, 132. *The Imperfect Enjoyment* p. 116 repeats the same theme more independently, with Donneish touches. Too little attention is paid by Prinz to the influence of Donne: had the German

¹⁾ Evidently owing to confusion of f and i.

²⁾ With this passage of Rochester ("Go Practice *Heliogabalus's Sin*/Forget to be a Man and learn to Spin") cp. l. 19 in (Marvell's?) *Britannia & Rawleigh*: "Like a tame spinster in's seraglio sits".

scholar remembered Donne's *Progresse of the Soule* he would hardly have remarked on p. 223 that "Rochester's views about the survival of the soul after death appear quite Buddhistic".¹⁾ Prinz omits also to trace Rochester's philosophical views (p. 220 f.) to a well-known passage of Lucretius (II, 646 ff.) and to a passage from Seneca's *Troas*, both translated by Rochester (see Hayward, pp. 45, 48).

To establish a satisfactory text of Rochester's works seems to be an extremely laborious, if not a hopeless task. The bibliography of his works, as Hayward remarks, is hardly less involved than that of Defoe's, and quite impossible to establish with any degree of assurance and satisfaction. Of these difficulties Prinz has been well aware when compiling his bibliography which, he recognises, "cannot, by any means, claim the merit of absolute completeness or of impeccable accuracy". Still, Prinz has taken considerable pains to make his record the most complete possible, thus breaking the ground for future research. Rochester's loose life not only encouraged the attribution to him of all manner of profligate rhymes, but even his original texts were deliberately corrupted by accentuating licentiousness. Hayward surmises that the text has been occasionally constituted by the aid of verbal memory. In a word, it is almost impossible to know exactly what was written by him: his poems were composed without a thought of futurity. No wonder, then, if Prinz and Hayward do not agree in their attributions. If we were to share Prinz's suspicions, seventeen of the poems included by Hayward should be considered spurious or at least suspect.²⁾ The most conspicuous piece of this group is *Rochester's Farewell*, which Prinz suspects to be an able forgery: "Burnet's work had created a huge literary sensation. No wonder, therefore, if it appeared as a promising speculation to follow in his wake and palm off upon the curious public something like the literary testament of the great sinner and convert" (p. 135). A passage against Buckingham, with whom Rochester is not known to have ever fallen out, seems to betray a different author. On the other hand, Prinz attributes to Rochester the play *Sodom*, and finds in it qualities of "literary skill, energy, concentration, and graphic power"; whereas Hayward, who thinks the play of little interest, maintains that there is sufficient evidence against the attribution. Rochester's disavowal (*On the Author of a Play called Sodom*) does not appear even to Hayward to carry much weight: considering Rochester's love of mystification, that disavowal might well be only a make-believe. Whoever, like the present writer, has not read the play, will hardly form any idea of it from the description of either of the two critics. To Hayward the play "seems to lack those 'peculiar Beauties' which, according to Saint Evremond, makes [*sic*] his looser Songs and pieces 'too dangerous to peruse'". For Prinz *Sodom* "does not only contain Rochester's characteristic wit and point, it is also written in the style typical of many of his authentic compositions". Let us conclude this painful subject with a remark of Prinz's (p. 152): "To find out the whole amount of what is not Rochester's is a task which cannot be performed without a careful comparative study of the

¹⁾ See also Lucian, *Gallus*, and Nano's account in Jonson's *Volpone*, I.

²⁾ Among Hayward's omissions is the four line epigram concluding the *Fifth Advice to the Painter* (cp. Margoliouth's edn. of Marvell, quot. below, I, p. 286). The lines seem very much conceived in the spirit of Rochester, to whom they are usually ascribed:

Bella fugis, Bellas sequeris, Belloque repugnas
Et Bellatori, sunt tibi Bella Thori.
Imbellis Imbellis amas, Audaxque videris
Mars ad opus Veneris, Martis ad Arma Venus.

minor facetious writers, pamphleteers and satirists of the Restoration period."

Such study would not only serve the purposes of the student of Rochester, but also of the student of those two older satirists, with whom Rochester has in common the subject matter of his political satires: Denham and Marvell. The recent editor of Marvell, H. M. Margoliouth,¹⁾ admits to have "raised rather than solved" some questions of authenticity: the fact that a scholar of his standing is found hesitating, shows how difficult those questions are.

It is a relief to turn from Hayward's unsatisfactory edition of Rochester to the scholarly work of Margoliouth, which casts into the shade the showy but "not perfectly accurate" reprint of Marvell's *Miscellaneous Poems*, 1681, published in 1923 by the Nonesuch Press. The text of the satires is based for the first time on contemporary manuscript copies, and some satires hitherto ascribed to Marvell are shown conclusively not to be his. Whoever reads (vol. I, p. 207) what pains it costs a conscientious editor to give a satisfactory text of those satires, will perhaps wonder whether the game is worth the candle, but, assuming that a modern edition of them rewards the efforts, he will admit that the only way to do it is the one adopted by Margoliouth, who has carefully collated manuscript versions, rather than the perfunctory one followed by Hayward, who has been content with examining a few printed miscellanies, without bothering about private collections or "unpublished manuscripts, hidden away, perhaps, but almost certainly extant".

Notwithstanding Margoliouth's general warning about the satires, that "internal evidence drawn from work of this quality is unlikely to be of much value" (I, p. 270,) the occurrence of certain peculiar similes amounts to almost a sign manual on the part of Marvell. Of such kind are: the allusion to the feather-pictures of the Indians (*Last Instructions*, l. 14), the mention of the louse seen in the microscope (id., l. 18, cp. *Upon Appleton House*, ll. 461-2), the double simile in ll. 51 ff., the mention of certain properties of china (id., l. 65, and *Elegy upon the Death of my Lord Francis Villiers*, l. 31, cp. *First Anniversary*, ll. 19-20), of the night-jasmine of India (*Last Instr.*, l. 345), the comparison with the bee closed in amber (id., l. 682, cf. Donne, ed. Grierson, vol. I, p. 219: "as an Amber drop enwraps a Bee"), with the tortoise groaning for the sea (id., l. 754),²⁾ with the sensitive plant (*Elegy*, l. 81, cp. *Appl. House* ll. 357-8). To the strange, exotic appeal of imagery of this kind, mostly derived from geographical and scientific

¹⁾ *The Poems and Letters of Andrew Marvell*, ed. by H. M. Margoliouth. Oxford, At the Clarendon Press, 1927. Vol. I, pp. xii + 348; vol. II, pp. viii + 374. Two vols. with six ills. 3ls.6d. Marvell is the subject of a forthcoming study by Pierre Legouis, which shall be reviewed in due time.

²⁾ Margoliouth says that he does not know the allusion. But cp. Aristotle, *Nat. Hist.* 590b, 4 sqq. See also Joach. Camerarii *Symbolorum Centuriae*, Cent. IV, 48: "Tradunt autem de marina testudine Arist. Oppian. et Plinius, illam fervente sole.... liberius se radiis eius in summitate maris exponere, donec sui oblita, cortice interim testaceo solis calore exsiccat, amplius in ima maris se immergere nequeat. Hoc igitur pacto voluptate libere spirandi deceptam, frustra se superne volventem gurgitem desiderantem, in piscatores hoc observantes incidere, illisque praedae fieri". For Camerarius this misfortune of the tortoise is illustrative of "empta dolore voluptas". Another of Marvell's similes (id., l. 949) drawn from the telescope applied to the sun, seems also to point to an emblem. In one of the many emblematic encyclopaedias, *Apelles Symbolicus* (publ. 1699), we find for instance (I, p. 60): "Solis macularum corpus, variis tubis opticis conspectum quorum cuivis non patent maculae. Non cuivis patent. Peccatorum venialium malitia, non cuivis patet."

curiosities, no poet, after Donne, was more sensitive than Marvell.¹⁾ Those similes are peculiar to him no less than the use of the epithet "green", which occurs twenty-five times — Margoliouth remarks (p. 219) — in the 1681 volume.

Green is Marvell's colour as red is Crashaw's. To the "purple" of "too rich a red", with which Crashaw's pages are hung, we find in Marvell a quiet counterpart of green undertones:

No white nor red was ever seen
So am'rous as this lovely green.

While for his satires Marvell is not greatly superior to most of his contemporaries, and is perhaps inferior to Rochester, for his lyric poems he reaches beyond the boundaries of his epoch, and, if on one hand he is clearly connected with the metaphysical poets, chiefly with Crashaw (see e. g. *Eyes and Tears*, I, p. 15), on the other hand by his habit of reading in "Natures mystick book",²⁾ by his wistful sense of space and time, his *Sehnsucht* for a "land of heart's desire" (*Bermudas, Dialogue between Thyrsis and Dorinda*), he is almost a romantic *avant la lettre*, thus showing in a maturer stage those latent possibilities which tantalise the reader of certain metaphysical poems. In the case of Crashaw's "nimble raptures" or of certain felicities of Donne's (of the kind of the famous ll. 244 ff. of *The Second Anniversary*) we may be wondering whether the surprisingly modern effect is rather an unpremeditated fruit of baroque boldness of conceits than the result of a real emotional discovery. But doubt is no longer possible with Marvell. The *concettista* of such poems as the flamboyant *Unfortunate Lover*³⁾ is still lurking behind the dazzling pageantry of silver and red in *The Nymph complaining for the death of her Faun* (cp. ll. 71-92 with Crashaw's *Bulla*), and behind those "fragrant volleys" "whose shrill report no Ear can tell, / But Echoes to the Eye and Smell" (I, p. 68), but the poet who wrote of "Hours.... reckon'd.... with herbs and flow'rs" and of "Desarts of vast Eternity", spoke of "annihilating all that's made / To a green Thought in a green Shade", and pictured oranges "like golden Lamps in a green Night" in the "remote *Bermudas*", is no distant relative of Coleridge who first saw in the western sky that "peculiar tint of yellow green", and of Wordsworth who heard the voice of the cuckoo "breaking the silence of the seas / Among the farthest Hebrides".

No satire of patriotic Marvell attains to the powerful effect of malignant Rochester's best lampoons, unless perhaps *The Kings Vowes*, which however is ascribed to Marvell on no solid ground (I, p. 288). In *Last Instructions to a Painter* the long drawn out parliamentary backbiting is hardly balanced by the commemoration of brave Douglas and the Rubens-like picture of the

¹⁾ It may not always be an easy task to appreciate to their full extent the similes of a XVII cent. poet. For instance, in ll. 32-3 of the poem *To his Coy Mistress*: "the youthful hew / Sits on thy skin like morning dew"; Margoliouth conjectures *lew* (warmth) in the place of *dew*. But the terms of the comparison are *youth* and *morning*: *hew* (which is proper to youth) sitting on the Mistress's skin, and *dew* (which is proper to morning) sitting on the leaves of a flower.

²⁾ One can judge how much Marvell outstrips the average contemporary poet in this respect by reading his *Garden* (I, p. 48) side by side with such typical verse as the opening lines of the second scene in the third act of Rochester's *Valentinian* ("Dear solitary groves"), or Sedley's *Pindaric Ode, written in a Garden*.

³⁾ In this poem, with the picturesque conclusion: "In a Field Sable a Lover Gules", and in the second stanza of the following one (*The Gallery*) Marvell's baroque imagination may seem curiously akin to Baudelaire's vein as instanced in *A une Madone, Un voyage à Cythère*.

King surrounded by sombre allegories, and these latter passages are not properly satirical. The poet who was prompted chiefly by a perverse pleasure of scathing his fellow-revellers, proves more forcible than he whose verse was dictated by indignation, probably because this indignation had reached a pitch where neither wit nor indeed poetry were longer possible but only action. But, while Marvell as a satirist is not above the average, as a lyric poet he stands head and shoulders above the best gifted of his contemporaries, with one single exception. With Rochester and Sedley — we are told by De Sola Pinto in the wake of Gosse — “we hear for the last time before the age of Blake and Burns the singing voice which is also the genuine voice of passionate feeling”. They were the last of a race, of that race of Court Poets which began with the circle of Wyatt and Surrey: their songs and *vers de société* find their antecedents in Elizabethan madrigals. But the singing voice which rose in the romantic age was of a different nature, and to this voice to come, Marvell’s voice seems singularly attuned. Rochester, if he led to anything, led to Byron, but Marvell points to Wordsworth, and the future was Wordsworth’s.

Liverpool.

MARIO PRAZ.

Notes and News.

International Congress of Linguists. The First International Congress of Linguists will meet at The Hague, April 10-15, under the presidency of Professor C. C. Uhlenbeck.

There will be plenary meetings for the discussion of general questions, such as the principles of phonetic notation, the definition and translation of linguistic terminology, methods of research in linguistic geography, the scientific description of languages, international organisation, and other subjects.

For the purpose of special papers and communications, the Congress will divide into three sections, for general linguistics, indo-european and non-indo-european languages respectively.

The Secretary-Treasurer of the Congress is Professor Jos. Schrijnen, St. Annastraat 17, Nijmegen.

B-Examen 1927. Het Bijvoegsel tot de Ned. Staatscourant van 23 en 24 Maart 1928, no. 60, bevat het verslag der commissie in 1927 belast geweest met het afnemen van de examens in de Engelse taal en letterkunde, middelbaar onderwijs B. Wij nemen er het volgende uit over:

„De uitslag van het examen was dit jaar gunstiger (wat de vrouwelijke kandidaten betreft) dan vorige jaren (bijna 44 pct. van haar, die zich hadden aangemeld verkregen het diploma). Bij de mannelijke kandidaten was de uitslag echter even ongunstig als verleden jaar; slechts 27 pct. van hen, die zich hadden aangemeld, konden worden toegelaten.

De in het algemeen onbevredigende uitslag geeft de commissie aanleiding de volgende opmerkingen te maken.

De letterkundige opstellen der kandidaten gaven herhaaldelijk blijk van onvoldoend overzicht van de te behandelen stof, waardoor deze opstellen, in plaats van op zich zelf een geheel te vormen, dikwijls een reeks van bijna onsamenvangende mededeelingen over het onderwerp bevatten. De bouw van zulke opstellen liet zeer veel te wenschen

over, en de commissie raadt daarom toekomstigen kandidaten aan zich te oefenen in het maken van opstellen volgens een door hen zelf met zorg samengesteld schema.

Ook de taal van vele opstellen, vooral van die der mannelijke kandidaten, was niet altijd boven verdenking verheven. De commissie is van meening, dat vele kandidaten door voorzichtig en opmerkzaam lezen van goede moderne boeken en tijdschriften hun eigen Engelsch behooren te zuiveren van en te vrijwaren voor onjuistheden, die in de opstellen niet kunnen worden toegelaten.

Bij het onderzoek naar de kennis van de historische spraakkunst kwam het herhaaldelijk aan den dag, dat de kandidaten nu en dan theorieën verkondigden, waarvan de onjuistheid sedert lang algemeen erkend is. Daar dit hoogstwaarschijnlijk is toe te schrijven aan het gebruik van verouderde handboeken, raadt de commissie toekomstigen kandidaten aan voorzichtig te zijn bij het aanschaffen of overnemen hunner studieboeken.

Uit het onderzoek naar de kennis der syntaxis bleek maar al te duidelijk, dat verreweg de meeste kandidaten den raad van de vorige commissie *niet* ter harte hadden genomen, daar velen hunner ook nu weer blijk gaven een aantal uit het hoofd geleerde feiten te kennen, zonder de beteekenis er van en hun verband met andere feiten in te zien. Toekomstige kandidaten kunnen alleen een grondig inzicht verkrijgen in de moderne syntaxis door bij hun studie van de oudere taal de syntaxis daarvan steeds met die van het hedendaagsch Engelsch te vergelijken. Dit zal hun ook zeer ten goede komen bij het vertalen van den hun voorgelegden oud-Engelschen tekst in modern Engelsch.

Wat de kennis der literatuur aangaat, bleek het te dikwijls, dat kandidaten wel in gewone handboeken iets gelezen hadden over belangrijke letterkundige werken, maar dat zij de juistheid (of onjuistheid) van het gelezene niet hadden getoetst aan deze werken zelf. Dit betrof zoowel den inhoud van de gelezen werken, als den vorm, waarin de inhoud was neergelegd. Met nadruk wijst de commissie er op, dat dergelijke kennis noch wetenschappelijke, noch practische waarde heeft. De commissie is er zich ten volle van bewust, dat de studie der Engelsche literatuur veelomvattend is, en dat zij daarom niet verlangen kan, dat er door de kandidaten *veel* gelezen en bestudeerd wordt van Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Milton, Dryden, Pope, Goldsmith, Cowper, Wordsworth, Scott, Byron, Coleridge, Keats, Shelley, Tennyson, Browning, Thackeray, Dickens, Hardy, enz., enz., maar zij verlangt wel, dat het weinige, dat de candidaat van dergelijke groote schrijvers weet, blijk geeft van eenig inzicht in de ontwikkeling van het geestesleven der Engelsche natie. Evenwicht tusschen het hoe en het hoeveel van het lezen en bestudeeren der letterkundige producten behoort aanwezig te zijn, en den toekomstigen kandidaten wordt aangeraden eerder de quantiteit van hun lezen te beperken, dan iets op te offeren van het inzicht in het gelezene, dat zoo absoluut noodzakelijk is om te weten wat eigenlijk bedoeld wordt met de studie (en de daaruit voortvloeiende kennis en waardeering) van de letterkunde.

Aangaande de gebleken kennis der stijlleur van de kandidaten meent de commissie dezelfde opmerking te moeten maken als aangaande de literatuur. Het geleerde was over het algemeen niet getoetst aan de werkelijkheid; de candidaat sprak maar al te vaak over een zaak, zonder zich goed bewust te zijn waarover het nu eigenlijk ging, zoo

zelfs, dat wanneer de examiner hem voorbeelden voorlegde van hetgeen door hem (den candidaat) werd beweerd, deze ook dan nog in gebreke bleef de waarheid (of onwaarheid) van zijn eigen woorden in te zien. Van een aankomend leeraar mag men iets beters verwachten. De commissie raadt daarom toekomstigen candidaten aan gebruik te maken van boeken zooals Hudson e.a., waarvan de oordeelkundige studie hen zal behoeden voor dergelijke tekortkomingen op het examen."

Reviews.

As You Like It. (The Works of Shakespeare edited for the Syndics of the Cambridge University Press by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON.) xviii & 181 pp. With frontispiece. Cambridge, 1926. 6/— net.

The most interesting feature of this new edition of Shakespeare's comedy is the monograph on "The Copy for *As You Like It*, 1623", from the hand of Mr. J. Dover Wilson. The only text we have is the one of the First Folio (1623). Whether the play underwent any changes between 1600, when it was entered on the Stationers' Register, and 1623, when it appeared in print for the first time, is hard to say. On the other hand it is likely that the play of 1600 (1599) is a revision of one written in the summer of 1593. There is, in the text, evidence of revision, and there are date-clues.

In the first place it would seem that the play originally contained more verse than it does now, because we find prose-passages which bear the traces of having originally been verse. This part of the evidence seems to me the weakest. Mr. Wilson reconstructs such a verse-passage by "some innocent faking". In my opinion he has only succeeded in making some very bad blank verse, which can hardly have been the original text.

In the second place there is the passage in the Folio (1. II. 75-9):

Cel. Prethee, who is 't that thou means't?

Clo. One that old Fredericke your Father loues.

Ros. My Fathers loue is enough to honor him enough; speake no more of him, you'l be whipt for taxation one of these daies.

Mr. Wilson thinks that the last sentence is, in the Folio, rightly given to Rosalind, from which it would appear that Rosalind's father, the banished (senior) duke is called Frederick. In 5. IV. 151 Celia's father is called Frederick. This confusion of names is owing to revision, says Mr. Wilson. When Shakespeare re-wrote the passage quoted, he had forgotten that he had given the name Frederick to the younger Duke. — There is a difficulty in this passage, of course, but it is not in the name Frederick, which the clown rightly gives to Celia's father; the difficulty is in the line following, which must be given to Celia, as was done by Theobald, and all editors after him. The italicized words suit Celia, the reigning Duke's daughter, much better than Rosalind, who is nobody at her uncle's court. Besides, it is not at all unnatural for honest Touchstone to criticize a tyrant by implying that he loves a knight without honour.

Fortunately for the revision-theory there is better evidence in the inconsistency as to the length of time that the banished Duke has lived in Arden. In the opening scene of the play we hear that the usurper duke has but very lately come into power. From a conversation between Celia and her father it appears that the elder duke was banished many years ago, when Celia

was too young to appreciate Rosalind. Besides the banished duke himself refers to a lengthy period of exile. The easiest explanation of this confusion is, of course, that Shakespeare re-wrote the opening scene, and forgot about the time the duke had been away.

Then there is the question, which was taller, Rosalind or Celia? Rosalind herself says, she is, and that is also Orlando's opinion. Le Beau, however, referring to the usurper duke says: "the taller is his daughter". Revision accounts for this too. The original Rosalind was a smaller boy than the one who played Celia. When this boy grew up, or when a taller boy took his place, the author had to assign the greater height to Rosalind, which he did in two places, but forgot in a third.

Internal evidence further points to the summer months of 1593 as the time when the play was first drafted. (a) The lines about the dead shepherd refer to Marlowe who was killed 30 May 1593. (b) Touchstone's remark about "a great reckoning in a little room" (3.III. 10) seems to point to the quarrel about a "reckoning" in which Marlowe found his death. (c) The mysterious connection of 3. II. 1 — 10 with Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (1592) points to the same early period, as does (d) the figure of Sir Oliver Martext.

Taking all together I think Mr. Wilson is right in assuming 1593 as the year of the first draft, and 1599 as that of the revision, which is substantially the text of the Folio.

There is also a literary introduction from the hand of Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch, which on the whole makes pleasant reading. Jaques is compared with Hamlet, and Touchstone with King Lear's fool, which things, though not exactly new, are always interesting to read about. We are told that "to philosophize the play is absurd", which is a good observation; and that "it has not been sufficiently noted that Shakespeare understood sisterly love", which seems not so good; and that "if one reads the later scenes we believe that Orlando suspected his Ganymede to be Rosalind", which is fatuous. It is expressly stated that Shakespeare's Arden is on the south bank of Avon, although the text places it somewhere in France, and its flora and fauna are gathered from all climates. There is a poetical description of the Forest of Arden in spring-time, which is not so innocent as it announces itself, because it offers an opportunity to the editor to have his fling at the noble army of Continental critics "who have not seen the phenomenon (of an English May-time) or heard the birds singing through it (and therefore) cannot understand this particular play. They have their own springtide, but not just this." — Of course the holidays are in August, and Dutch larks are not English wood-pigeons, but I don't call this nice, do you? And then two venerable Germans, long dead, are set side by side to show "how absurdly these two critics contradict one another". As if the essence of aesthetic criticism were not contradicting those people who criticized before you!

A third section in this book is formed by the Notes and a fourth by the Glossary. On what principle one word is included in the notes and another in the Glossary I have been unable to discover. All I can say is, that the lumping together of the explanatory notes at the end of the volume, and under two different headings at that, has been a strain on my temper. When one is studying a text one likes to have the textual and explanatory notes handy at the foot of the page, as is done in Furness and the "Arden" Edition, for instance. Here one has constantly to refer to three different sections (Textual Introduction, Notes and Glossary), all the while trying to keep the book open at the page one is reading. I can understand why this arrangement was resorted to. A page with notes at the bottom is supposed

to irritate a certain class of readers. If so, editors had better decide from the start whether they are going to write (and edit) for the general reader or for the advanced student. It is hard to serve two masters.

As for the notes themselves, they are good, on the whole. The derivation of Jaques' *ducdame* from the Romani *dukra mē* = I foretell, seems satisfactory. That Rosalind in 1. II. 131 cannot refer to part music, but with her "broken music" "means simply a broken musical instrument, and refers to the ribs i. e. the curved strips of wood which were glued together to form the body of the lute", must be clear. I cannot see that 1. II. 88 proves that Le Beau speaks mincingly, nor is there any reason to identify this gentleman with the knight of the Pancake.

In discussing certain idiomatic expressions which are no longer current, it is the custom with scientific editors to give cross-references to other Elizabethan works where the phrase is found, so that the reader can form his own opinion. This is sometimes done in these notes, but not nearly often enough. The following is a typical instance of the method adopted in this edition :

4. I. 160,61 "A man that had a wife with such a wit, he might say "*Wit, whither wilt?*"

Note: — an Elizabethan phrase commonly addressed to foolish prattlers. Cf. note 1. II. 52.

Note 1. II. 52: — *Wit! whither wander you?* alluding, of course, to the wandering wits of a "natural", and to the Elizabethan phrase "wit, whither wilt?" commonly addressed to persons who let their tongues run away with them. Cf. 4. I. 161."

The reader will see that nothing is adduced in support of the assertion that this is indeed a phrase commonly addressed in Elizabethan times to foolish prattlers. The general reader may accept the explanation on the authority of the learned commentator, students require something more. This lack of cross-references is a drawback in these otherwise very good notes.

I now come to the text, which displays some very remarkable features. These, by the way, it shares with those of the other volumes of this series. In the first place there are the elaborate stage-directions. Everybody knows that the stage-directions of the Folio are scanty, so that a modern reader often has to puzzle things out for himself. The older editors, from Rowe onwards, have added some useful directions, but they always limited themselves to the strictly necessary. This edition has completely broken with the tradition by introducing long descriptive directions. The editors excuse their proceeding by saying that they write not for the Elizabethan actor but for the modern reader. Frankly admitting that they do make things clear, and so enable the general reader to enjoy the play at his ease, I was startled at innovations like the following :

1. *The wrestling begins; they close, Orlando skilfully securing the better hold.*
2. *The wrestlers sway and strain to and fro, till of a sudden Charles is thrown heavily to the ground.*
3. *Rosalind on a couch with her face to the wall, Celia bending over her.*
4. *The entrance to a cave, with a spreading tree before it.*
5. *Jaques is seen coming through the trees, a smile upon his face, and shortly behind him Amiens, who silently takes his seat next to the Duke at the meal when he comes up.*

I only give a few instances. Now in the first place I don't like my Shakespeare in this modern dress. After all it is rather a relief, after Shaw and Barrie, suddenly to come on such a direction as the one *Julius Caesar* opens with: *Act I, Scene I, Rome. A Street.* There it stands in its bare nobility. When the palate has got used to this dry stuff, it does not take kindly to the succulent tit-bits instanced above. And then, in the second place, is it permitted to any editor, I ask, so to tamper with holy writ?

Does it not befit us to treat the page of Shakespeare with more respect?

With the punctuation the editors have made a much luckier hit. Mr. P. Simpson and Prof. A. W. Pollard have made it clear that the ungrammatical punctuation of the Folio and Quartos has dramatical value. The comma denotes a pause, the semi-colon a longer pause, the colon a still longer pause, the period a full stop. Brackets denote a drop in the voice, or special emotion. By a simple and ingenious system the editors have succeeded in so transposing these punctuation-marks, that a modern reader has the full benefit of them.

The divisions into acts and scenes of the Folio, being "void of authority" are wholly discarded in this edition. That it is not so easy to shake off the tradition of three centuries is shown by the fact, that the original divisions have been kept for purposes of reference, at the head of the page, in the margin, and in the notes.

There is a stage-history of the play, too short to be of much use, and a fine portrait of Michael Drayton, "whose description of the Forest of Arden in *Polyolbion VIII* has many points of resemblance to Shakespeare's Arden in this play".

The book is recommended to the advanced student for the shrewd textual criticism, and for many of the notes which bring the very newest discoveries concerning the meaning of difficult passages. Also the punctuation of the text deserves praise. The endeavour to serve the general public as well as the student has given the book an amphibious character, which is unsatisfactory. It is beautifully got up.

Amsterdam.

H. DE GROOT.

Psychology and Primitive Culture, by F. C. BARTLETT, M.A. — Cambridge Univ. Press, 1923. — 8/6 net.

'The fundamental forms of man's social reactions', 'Psychology and the folk story', 'The psychological study of the contact of peoples', 'Special devices in the elaboration and simplification of culture', these and similar headings of chapters look promising, and in spite of a certain surplus of thoroughness and severity of method it must in all fairness be conceded that the promises are kept, the book being indeed of great interest and displaying vast erudition. It may, of course, be urged that psychology cannot yet be regarded as a well-defined science, and that this fact is responsible for many misunderstandings and even . . . squabbles among its students or votaries. But on the other hand, this same fact exerts a fascination of its own.

Psychology is generally regarded as dealing essentially with the individual, and by simply considering the laws of the individual mental life, and without troubling about any form of social grouping, eminent scholars, like Taylor and Frazer, have arrived at seemingly satisfactory explanations of many 'origins'. But, says Professor Bartlett, 'there are some individual responses which simply do not occur outside a social group', (p. 13) and to ignore the function of the group is to court failure. 'To construct social behaviour out of individual attitudes is . . . a hopeless task.' (p. 18).

A chapter that should prove of special interest to literary men is the third, dealing with the folk story. Mr. Bartlett complains of psychologists having given less consideration to the popular tale than the interest of the subject warrants. Together with his book, however, appeared in France the extensive study of P. Saintyves on *Les Contes de Perrault*. The French

scholar's position is essentially the same as Mr. Bartlett's. He looks for 'origins' in 'coutumes primitives' and 'liturgies populaires'. But even after reading the French book one will find that this third chapter amply repays perusal. — On page 136 (eleventh and twelfth line from bottom) the words *constant* and *contact* should change places.

W. v. D.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey. Being Examples of Conventional Secular Poetry, exclusive of Romance, Ballad, Lyric, and Drama, in the Period from Henry IV. to Henry VIII. Edited, with Introductions and Notes, by ELEANOR PRESCOTT HAMMOND. 9¾ × 7¼, xii. + 591 pp. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 32s. 6d. n.

De Consolatione Philosophiae. By BOETHIUS. Translated by JOHN WALTON. Edited, with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by MARK SCIENCE. 9 × 6, lxvii. + 379 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 30s. n.

The Siege or Batayle of Troye. A Middle-English Metrical Romance. Edited from Manuscripts, Lincoln's Inn 150, Egerton 2862, Arundel xxii., with Harley 525 included in the Appendix. By MARY ELIZABETH BARNICLE. 9 × 6, lxxiv. + 274 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 25s. n.

The Pastime of Pleasure. By STEPHEN HAWES. A Literal Reprint of the Earliest Complete Copy (1517), with variant readings from the editions of 1509, 1554, and 1555, together with Introduction, Notes, Glossary, and Indexes by WILLIAM EDWARD MEAD. 9 × 5¾, cxvi. + 259 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 15s. n.

Loving Mad Tom. Bedlamite verses of the XVI and XVII Centuries. With five illustrations by NORMAN LINDSAY. Foreword by ROBERT GRAVES. The text edited, with notes, by JACK LINDSAY. Musical transcriptions by PETER WARLOCK. 11½ × 9, 110 pp. Fanfrolico Press. 42s.

Seventeenth Century Lyrics. Edited, with short Biographies, Bibliographies and Notes, by ALEXANDER CORBIN JUDSON. 8¾ × 6, xix. + 413 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. n.

Seventeenth Century Lyrics. From the Original Texts, Chosen, Edited, and Arranged by NORMAN AULT. 7¾ × 5¼, xi. + 524 pp. Longmans. 10s. 6d. n.

Covent Garden Drollery: A Miscellany of 1672. Edited by G. THORN-DRURY. 7¾ × 5¼, xxi. + 154 pp. Dobell. 12s. n.

Poems. By ANNE, COUNTESS OF WINCHILSEA, 1661-1720. Selected and with an Introductory Essay by JOHN MIDDLETON MURRY. 8 × 5½, 112 pp. Jonathan Cape. 5s. n.

Endymion: A Poetic Romance. By JOHN KEATS. Type Facsimile of the First Edition, with Introduction and Notes by H. CLEMENT NOTCUTT. Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d. n.

The Tower. By W. B. YEATS. 8 × 5¼, vi. + 110 pp. Macmillan. 1928. 6s. n.

The Reule of Crysten Religioun. By REGINALD PECOCK. D.D. Now first edited from Pierpont Morgan MS. 519 by WILLIAM CABELL GREET. 9 × 6, xxxi. + 539 pp. For the Early English Text Society. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 35s. n.

Micro-Cosmographie. Or a Piece of the World Discovered in Essayes and Characters. By JOHN EARLE. Edited by GWENDOLEN MURPHY. 10¾ × 8. vi. + 74 pp. Waltham St. Lawrence, Berks: Golden Cockerell Press. 25s. n.

The Works of Sir Thomas Browne. Complete in Six Volumes. Newly Edited by GEOFFREY KEYNES. Vol. I. Religio Medici, Christian Morals, A Letter to a Friend. 7¾ × 5¼, xii. + 189 pp. Faber and Gwyer. 84s. n. the set.

Tricks of the Town: Eighteenth-Century Diversions. Being Reprints of Three Eighteenth-Century Tracts. With an Introduction by RALPH STRAUS. 9¼ × 6¼, xxv. + 256 pp. Chapman and Hall. 21s. n.

The Characters of Lord Chesterfield. Edited, with an Introduction, by CHARLES WHIBLEY. Peter Davies, 2s. n.

The Man of Feeling. By HENRY MACKENZIE. Edited with an introduction by HAMISH MILES. Pp. 208. The Scholartis Press. London. 1928. 7/6 net. [A review will appear.]

The Short Stories of Thomas Hardy. Complete in one volume containing about 1,100 pages. With end-paper Map of Wessex. Macmillan, 1928. 7s. 6d. n.

The Complete Works of O. Henry. 8 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$, xi. + 1395 pp. Kingswood, Surrey: Associated Bookbuyers' Company. 15s. 6d. n.

Last Post. By FORD MADDOX FORD. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 292 pp. Duckworth. 7s. 6d. n.

The Strange Vanguard: A Fantasia. By ARNOLD BENNETT. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 328 pp. Cassell. 7s. 6d. n.

The Unburied Dead. By STEPHEN MCKENNA. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 316 pp. Thornton Butterworth. 7s. 6d. n.

The Mercury Book. Second Series. Being selections from Volumes III. and IV. of the *London Mercury*. Compiled by H. COTTON MINCHIN, with a foreword by J. C. SQUIRE. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 7, vii. + 242 pp. Williams and Norgate. 1928. 7s 6d. n.

The Best Short Stories of 1927. Vol. I. English. (With an Irish Supplement.) 421 pp. Vol. II. American. (With the Yearbook of the American Short Story.) 460 pp. Edited by EDWARD J. O'BRIEN. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$. Jonathan Cape. 1928. 7s. 6d. n. each volume.

Wintersmoon. Passages in the Lives of two Sisters, Janet and Rosalind Grandison. By HUGH WALPOLE. 8 $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 620 pp. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. n.

Etched in Moonlight. By JAMES STEPHENS. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 199 pp. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. n.

The Tempest, Twelfth Night, Coriolanus, Macbeth. By WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE. A Facsimile of the First Folio Text. With an Introduction by J. DOVER WILSON, and a list of Modern Readings. 12 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 8 $\frac{1}{2}$. Faber and Gwyer. 6s. n. each.

The Complete Works of Thomas Shadwell. Edited by MONTAGUE SUMMERS. (In five volumes.) Vol. I., cclxiv. + 313 pp. Vol. II., 403 pp. Vol. III., 415 pp. Vol. IV., 441 pp. Vol. V., 462 pp. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 8. The Fortune Press. 1928. 10s. the set.

The Complete Works of Sir John Vanbrugh. The Plays Edited by BONAMY DOBREE. The Letters Edited by GEOFFREY WEBB. In four volumes. 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 8. Vol. I. xlv. + 239 pp. Vol. II. 256 pp. Vol. III. 290 pp. Vol. IV. xli. + 284 pp. Nonesuch Press. 1928. 63s. n.

The Making of an Immortal: A play in One Act. By GEORGE MOORE. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 59 pp. Faber and Gwyer. 63s. n.

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

Writings ascribed to Richard Rolle, hermit of Hampole, and materials for his biography. By H. E. ALLEN. Pp. xvi + 568. The Modern Language Association of America, Monograph Series, III. New York, Heath & Co., London, Milford. 1927. Price 30/- net. [A review will appear.]

Medieval Plays in Scotland. Thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph. D. of the University of St. Andrews, July, 1924. By ANNA JEAN MILL. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 356 pp. Published for St. Andrews University by Milford. 10 s. n.

The Dialogue Concerning Tyndale. By SIR THOMAS MORE. Reproduced in black letter facsimile from William Rastell's Edition of More's English Works (1557). Edited with a modern version of the same and an essay on the Spirit and Doctrine of the Dialogue by W. E. CAMPBELL. With an Historical Introduction and Philological Notes by A. W. REED. 11 $\times$ 7 $\frac{3}{4}$. Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1928. 30s. n.

The Life and Correspondence of Lodowick Bryskett. By HENRY R. PLOMER and TOM PEETE CROSS. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$, xi. + 69 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 1928. 10s. n.

Shakespeare: Truth and Tradition. By the late DR. JOHN S. SMART. With a memoir by Prof. W. MACNEILE DIXON. Arnold, 1928. 7s. 6d. n.

Shakespeare in America. By ASHLEY THORNDIKE. Annual Shakespeare Lecture, 1927. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$, 22 pp. For the British Academy. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1s. n.

Shakespeare, Actor-Poet. As Seen by his Associates, Explained by Himself, and Remembered by the Succeeding Generation. By CLARA LONGWORTH DE CHAMBRUN. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$, 356 pp. Appleton. 1928. 10s. 6d. n.

Shakespeare as a Letter Writer and Artist in Prose. A Disquisition, Two Anthologies, and a Ramble. By R. L. MÉGROZ. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 223 pp. Wishart. 7s. 6d. n.

John Bunyan. By R. H. COATS. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ $\times$ 5, 128 pp. Student Christian Movement. 4s. n.

A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800. By R. S. CRANE and F. B. KAYE. With the assistance of M. E. PRIOR. $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, 205 pp. Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press.

John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester. His Life and Writings. With his Lordship's private correspondence, various other documents, and a bibliography of his works and of the literature on him. By JOHANNES PRINZ. With a portrait of Rochester and 16 facsimiles. Pp. x + 460. Leipzig, Mayer & Müller. 1927. [Palaestra 154]. M. 32. [See Review.]

An Appreciation of Colley Cibber, Actor and Dramatist. Together with a reprint of his play *The Careless Husband*. By D. M. E. HABBEMA. 24×16 c.M., pp. 190. Amsterdam, Paris, 1928.

Diss. Amsterdam.

The Unspeakable Curll, being some account of Edmund Curll, Bookseller: To which is added a list of his books. By RALPH STRAUS. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, xii. + 322 pp. Chapman and Hall. 42s. n.

More English Diaries: Further Reviews of Diaries from the XVI. to the XIX. Century. With an introduction on Diary Reading by ARTHUR PONSONBY. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, viii. + 250 pp. Methuen. 1928. 6d. n.

Scottish and Irish Diaries: From the XVI. to the XIX. Century. With an introduction by ARTHUR PONSONBY. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, viii. + 192 pp. Methuen. 10s. 6d. n.

Erziehungsfragen in den Romauen von Richardson, Fielding, Smollett, Goldsmith und Sterne. Von E. BINZ-WINIGER. 8° pp. 86. Phil. Diss. Zürich 1926.

L'Influence des "Saisons" de Thomson sur la poésie descriptive en France (1759-1810). Par M. CAMERON. Pp. 200. Paris, Champion, 1927. 30 fr.

Portrait of Lady Mary Wortley Montagu. By IRIS BARRY. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, 294 pp. E. Benn. 15s. n.

Manuscript Commonplace Book. By HORACE WALPOLE. $4\frac{1}{2} \times 2\frac{3}{4}$ New York: W. E. Rudge. \$ 15.

The Anecdotes and Egotisms of Henry Mackenzie, 1745-1831. Edited with an Introduction by HAROLD WILLIAM THOMPSON. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, xxxiv. + 303 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1923. 25s. n.

Journal of a tour in the Highlands made in the year 1787. By ROBERT BURNS. Reproduced in Facsimile from his Original Manuscript, in the Possession of Mr. William K. Bixby. With Introduction and Transcript by J. C. EWING. $10\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Gowans and Gray. 12s. 6d. n.

Der Mönch in der englischen Literatur bis auf Lewis's „Monk“ 1795. Von R. SCHNEIDER. 8°. iv + 65 pp. Phil. Diss. Berlin 1927.

William Blake: Creative Will and the Poetic Image. By JACK LINDSAY. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 56 pp. Fanfrolico Press. 3s. 6d. n.

Some Strange English Literary Figures of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries in a Series of Lectures by LAFCADIO HEARN. Edited by R. TANABÉ. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 140 pp. Kanda, Tokyo: Hokuseido Press. 2 yen.

La Littérature portugaise en Angleterre à l'époque romantique. Par F. WALTER. Pp. 148. Paris, Champion, 1927. 25 fr.

Jane Austen. By R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 171 pp. Sheed and Ward. 5s. n.

Studies in the influence of Sir Walter Scott in Spain. By E. ALLISON PEERS. $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, 160 pp. New York: Paris.

Sir Walter Scott's Novels on the Stage. By HENRY ADELBERT WHITE. $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$. 259 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. n.

Coleridge, le Somnambule sublime. Par J. CHARPENTIER. Perrin, 1927. 12 fr.

A Diary of Thomas de Quincey, 1803. Here Reproduced in Replica as well as in Print from the Original Manuscript in the Possession of the Reverend C. H. Steel. Edited by HORACE A. EATON. 9×7 , ix. + 252 pp. Noel Douglas, 21s. n.

The Correspondence of Henry Crabb Robinson with the Wordsworth Circle. (1808-1866). The Greater Part now for the first time printed from the Originals in Dr. William's Library, London. Chronologically arranged and edited with Introduction, Notes, and Index by EDITH J. MORLEY. In Two Volumes, with Portraits and Facsimiles. 9×6 . Vol. I., 1808-1843, xii. + 537 pp. Vol. II., 1844-1866, 539-904 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1927. 42s. n.

Le Secret de Byron. Par VIVIE DE RÉGIE. E. Paul, 1927. 10 fr.

Prefaces by Leigh Hunt. Mainly to His Periodicals. Edited by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 150 pp. Frank Hollings. 20s. n.

Shelley: His Life and Work. By WALTER EDWIN PECK. In two volumes. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$. Vol. I., xiii. + 532 pp.; Vol. II., vii. + 490 pp. Ernest Benn. 50s. n.

Shelley: His Theory of Poetry. By MELVIN T. SOLVE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xv. + 207 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 15s. n.

Shelley und die bildende Kunst. Von ILSE O'SULLIVAN-KÖHLING. Pp. 230. Halle, Niemeyer, 1928. Geh. RM. 8.— [A review will appear.]

Harriet Martineau. An essay in comprehension. By THEODORA BOSANQUET. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xi. + 256 pp. Etchells and Macdonald. 15s. n.

Lord Macaulay: The Pre-eminent Victorian. By S. G. ROBERTS. $10 \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 18 pp. For the English Association. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. n.

Carlyle: His Rise and Fall. By NORWOOD YOUNG. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 382 pp. Duckworth. 1928. 12s. 6d. n.

Charles Dickens, and Other Victorians. By SIR A. QUILLER-COUCH. $7\frac{1}{4} \times 4\frac{3}{4}$, 224 pp. Cambridge University Press. 5s. n.

First published in 1925.

William Makepeace Thackeray. By LEWIS MELVILLE. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 6$, xvii. + 437 pp. E. Benn. 1927. 21s. n.

Originally published in 1889 and now, for the first time, issued in one volume.

Publications of the English Goethe Society. New Series. Vol. IV. Edited by J. G. ROBERTSON. *Matthew Arnold and Goethe.* By JAMES BENTLEY ORRICK. 9×6 , 54 pp. For the Society by Alexander Moring.

The Old Yellow Book. The Source of Browning's "The Ring and the Book." A new Translation, with Explanatory Notes and Critical Chapters upon the Poem and its Source. By JOHN MARSHALL GEST. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xv. + 698 pp. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press. London: Milford. 21s. n.

First published in England in 1925 by Mr. Arthur F. Bird at 35s.

Browning's Parleyings. The Autobiography of a Mind. By WILLIAM CLYDE DE VANE, JR. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, xxiii. + 306 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 18s. n.

Le Roman de Bas-de-Cuir: étude sur Fenimore Cooper et son influence en France. Par M. N. GIBB. Pp. 227. Paris, Champion. 1927. 40 fr.

Trollope. A Commentary. By MICHAEL SADLEIR. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, ix. + 432 pp. Constable. 7s. 6d. n.

First published last year at 15s.

Robert Louis Stevenson. By G. K. CHESTERTON. $7\frac{1}{8} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 259 pp. Hodder and Stoughton. 6s. n.

Studies in Literature, 1789-1877 (Eleventh Edition.) $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xii. + 523 pp. *New Studies in Literature.* $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xi. + 451 pp. By EDWARD DOWDEN. Kegan Paul, 7s. 6d. n. each.

A History of the American Drama: From the Civil War to the Present Day. By ARTHUR HOBSON QUINN. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. From Augustin Daly to the Death of Clyde Fitch. xvi + 296 pp. Vol. II. From William Vaughan Moody to the Present Day. ix. + 359 pp., 9×6 . Harper. 36s. n.

The Eighteen Nineties: A Review of Art and Ideas at the Close of the Nineteenth Century. By HOLBROOK JACKSON. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, 304 pp. Jonathan Cape. 10s. 6d. n.

First published in 1913.

A Miscellany of Tracts and Pamphlets. Edited, with a Preface and Introductory Notes, by A. C. WARD. (The World's Classics.) 6×4 , xix. + 565 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. n.

Joseph Conrad: Life and Letters. By G. JEAN-AUBRY. In Two Volumes. $10 \times 6\frac{1}{2}$. Vol. I., xi. + 339 pp. Vol. II., ix. + 376 pp. Heinemann. 42s. n.

John Drinkwater als Dramatiker. Von A. W. ROEDER. Pp. 58. Giessen, 1927. M. 0.75.

Studien zur Geschichte und Charakteristik des Refrains in der englischen Literatur. Von F. G. RUHRMANN. Anglistische Forschungen, 64. Pp. vii + 179. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1927. M. 10.50. [A review will appear.]

Englische Metrik in ihren Grundzügen an Hand ausgewählter Textproben dargestellt. Von R. SPINDLER. 8°. pp. 229. München: Hueber 1927. RM. 5.00; geb. 7.—

Thomas Hardy from Serial to Novel. By MARY ELLEN CHASE. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, 207 pp. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Talks with Thomas Hardy at Max Gate. 1920-1922. By VERE H. COLLINS. $9 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xvi. + 85 pp. Duckworth. 1928. 6s. n.

Castles in Spain, and Other Sereeds. By JOHN GALSWORTHY. $7 \times 4\frac{3}{4}$, vii. + 190 pp. Heinemann. 3s. 6d. n.

The Classical Tradition in Poetry. The Charles Eliot Norton Lectures. By GILBERT MURRAY. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xi. + 274 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

A Survey of Modernist Poetry. By LAURA RIDING and ROBERT GRAVES. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 295 pp. Heinemann. 7s. 6d. n.

New Paths on Helicon. By HENRY NEWBOLT. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xvi. + 428 pp. Nelson. 7s. 6d. n.

Poetry To-day. By IOLO A. WILLIAMS. (The To-day Library.) $7 \times 4\frac{1}{2}$, 138 pp. Herbert Jenkins. 2s. 6d. n.

The Prospects of Literature. By LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH. $6\frac{3}{4} \times 4\frac{1}{4}$, 35 pp. Hogarth Essays. Second Series. Hogarth Press. 1928. 1s. 6d. n.

Panorama de la Littérature anglaise contemporaine. Par R. LALOU. Pp. 240. Paris, Kra. 1927. 13 fr. 50.

Aspects of the Novel. By E. M. FORSTER. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 224 pp. Arnold. 1927. 7s. 6d. n.

Edinburgh as a Literary Centre. By LEWIS SPENCE. (Library Association Conference, Edinburgh, 1927.) $9\frac{3}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, 8 pp. Edinburgh: Library Association.

Essays and Studies. By Members of the English Association. Vol. xiii. Collected by CAROLINE SPURGEON. Pp. 144. Milford, 1928. 7/6 net. [A review will appear.]

Maarten Maartens. Poet and Novelist. By W. VAN MAANEN. $24\frac{1}{2} \times 16$ c.m. Pp. 168. Groningen, Noordhoff, 1928. Price f3.50, cloth f4.50.

Diss. Amsterdam

Essays by Divers Hands. Being the Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature of the United Kingdom. New Series. Vol. VII. Edited by MARGARET L. WOODS. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xv. + 156 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1928. 7s. n.

LANGUAGE.

Romans, Kelts and Sacons in Ancient Britain. An Investigation into the Two Dark Centuries (400-600) of English History. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, 93 pp. Upsala: Almqvist and Wiksells. 3 kr. [A review will appear.]

Studien zu King Horn. Von P. LEIDIG. 8°. ix + 100 pp. Phil. Diss. München 1927.

Der Lautbestand des süd-mittelenglischen Octavian, verglichen mit seinen Entsprechungen im Lybaeus Desconus und im Launfal. Von Dr. ERNA FISCHER. Pp. viii + 216. Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 63. Heidelberg, Carl Winter, 1927. Geh. M. 14.— [A review will appear.]

Studien zur Geschichte der Sprachphilosophie. Von OTTO FUNKE. I: Zur Sprachphilosophie des 18 Jahrhunderts: J. Harris' "Hermes". II: Zur Sprachphilosophie der Gegenwart. Neujaarsblätter der Literarischer Gesellschaft Bern. Der neuen Folge sechstes Heft. Pp. 140. Bern, A. Francke A.-G. 1927. Fr. 4.80. [A review will appear.]

Lautlehre der schottischen Mundart im südöstlichen Perthshire. Von A. HELDMANN. Giessener Beiträge, iii, 2. Pp. 154-204. Breslau, 1927.

Die Volkssprache im Nordosten der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika. Von J. A. HEIL. Giessener Beiträge, iii, 2. Pp. 205-311. Breslau, 1927.

A New Glossary of the Dialect of the Huddersfield District. By WALTER E. HAIGH. $9 \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xxix. + 166 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1928. 12s. 6d. n.

A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles. Part II. Syntax. Vol. I. 3. ed., with an append. By O. JESPERSEN. 8°. xxviii + 512 pp. Heidelberg: Winter 1927. RM. 11.50; geb. 13.50.

Id. Part III. Syntax. 2nd. vol. 8°. ix + 115 pp. Heidelberg: Winter 1927. RM. 11.50; geb. 13.50. [See Reviews, E.S. Oct. and Dec. 1927.]

A Syntax of Living English. By A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH. Pp. xii + 330. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Sewed f4.90. Cloth f5.50. [See Review, Febr. 1928.]

An English Grammar for Dutch Students. By E. KRUISINGA. Vol. I. A Shorter Accidence and Syntax. Fourth edition. Pp. xvi + 230. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1928. Sewed f3.50. Cloth f3.90.

The English Language in Ireland. By JEREMIAH J. HOGAN. $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, 96 pp. Dublin: Educational Company of Ireland. 3s. 6d. n.

English Pronunciation Through Questions and Answers. By H. E. PALMER and F. G. BLANDFORD. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xxi. + 119 pp. Cambridge: Heffer. 3s. 6d. n.

Neuaufbau der Grammatik als Grundlegung zu einem wissenschaftlichen System der Sprachbeschreibung. Von THEODOR KALEPKY. Pp. viii $\times$ 105. Leipzig-Berlin, Teubner 1928. RM. 3.20. [A review will appear.]

The New Century Dictionary of The English Language: Based on matter selected from the Original Century Dictionary and entirely rewritten, with the addition of a great amount of new material and containing the great mass of Words and Phrases in ordinary use. 12,000 quotations, 4,000 pictorial illustrations. Edited by H. G. EMERY and K. G. BREWSTER. With Supplements of Synonyms and Antonyms, Foreign Words and Phrases, Biographical Names, Geographical Names, &c. In three volumes. $11 \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Vol. I. A-Leavening. viii. + 936 pp. Vol. II. Leaver-Stone. pp. 937-1,852. Vol. III. Stone-China-Zymurgy. Supplements pp. 1,853-2,792. Century Company and P. F. Collier and Son Co. London: Bumpus. 1928. 84s. n.

HISTORY.

Five Centuries of Religion. By G. G. COULTON. In four volumes. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$. Volume II. The Friars and the Dead Weight of Tradition, 1200-1400 A.D. xxx. + 703 pp. Cambridge University Press. 31s. 6d. n.

England from Chaucer to Caxton. By H. S. BENNETT. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, xii. + 246 pp. Methuen. 1928. 6s. n. [A review will appear.]

An Oxford Hall in Medieval Times. Being the Early History of St. Edmund Hall. By ALFRED B. EMDEN. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xvi. + 320 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 16s. n.

Froissart's Cronycles. Translated out of the French by SIR JOHN BOURCHIER, LORD BERNERS. Vol. I., Part I. xxxvi. + 311 pp. Part II., pp. 313-658. Part III. pp. 665-1,022. Oxford: Blackwell. The Set in Eight Volumes, 25 guineas.

The Principal Navigations, Voyages, Traffiques and Discoveries of the English Nation, made by Sea or Overland to the Remote and Farthest Distant Quarters of the Earth at any Time within the Compasse of these 1600 Years. (In eight volumes.) By RICHARD HAKLUYT. With an Introduction by JOHN MASEFIELD. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$. Vol. V. x. + 355 pp. Vol. VI. ix. + 360 pp. J. M. Dent. 60s. n. in sets only.

Sir Walter Raleigh. By MILTON WALDMAN. (The Golden Hind Series). 9×6 , xi. + 255 pp. John Lane. 12s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

King James's Secret: Negotiations between Elizabeth and James VI. Relating to the Execution of Mary Queen of Scots, from the Warrender Papers. Edited by ROBERT S. RAIT and ANNIE I. CAMERON. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xvii. + 214 pp. Nisbet and Co. 12s. 6d. n.

A Tour Thro' the Whole Island of Great Britain: Divided into Circuits or Journies giving A Particular and Diverting Account of whatever is Curious and worth Observation. Particularly fitted for the Reading of such as desire to Travel over the Island. By DANIEL DEFOE. With an Introduction by G. D. H. COLE. In two volumes. Vol. I., xxxi. + 415 pp. Vol. II., viii. + pp. 416-858. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$. Peter Davies. 63s. n.

Manners Makyth Man. An anthology from the great writers illustrating English manners and customs throughout the centuries Selected and edited by R. BRIMLEY JOHNSON. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 377 pp. Philpot. 15s. n.

The Social Life of Scotland in the Eighteenth Century. By HENRY GREY GRAHAM. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, xii. + 545 pp. Black. 1928. 6s. n.

A low-priced reprint of Mr. Grey Graham's admirably full and careful survey.

The Letters of Junius. Edited with an introduction by C. W. EVERETT. 9×6 , lviii. + 410 pp. Faber and Gwyer. 21s. n.

The House of Lords in the XVIIIth Century. By A. S. TURBERVILLE. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$, 556 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 21s. n.

A History of the University of Oxford. By C. E. MALLET. Vol. III., *Modern Oxford*. xxiii. + 530 pp. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$. Methuen. 21s. n.

The Gerund preceded by the Common Case.

A Study in Historical Syntax.

(Concluded.)

15. The *B*-type construction 'I insist upon Miss Sharp appearing' is discussed at considerable length by Jespersen in Tract No. xxv of the *S. P. E.*, *On some disputed Points in English Grammar*, 147ff. On p. 154 Jespersen enumerates the causes — eight in all — that in his opinion have led to the construction constantly gaining ground. What strikes one about the quotations adduced by Jespersen to substantiate his statements, is that with the exception of about half a dozen examples from Shakespeare, they all date from the beginning of the eighteenth century onwards. Now as Jespersen has come to the conclusion that "If I am not mistaken, it (i.e. the *B* type) begins to appear about 1700" (p. 150), he ought to have given quotations of an earlier date. In the ordinary course of things the cause precedes the result.

16. As a matter of fact, instances in which the [pro]noun before the gerund is not a genitive, simply because the genitive is impossible, or would be awkward, or because it has the same form as the common case, or in which we find the pronoun *her* (see Jespersen's eight causes), do occur before 1700, as is proved by the following quotations.

- c. 1300 *Cursor Mundi* 2396 f., C, *þe land, þat in þan fel a hunger strang, Thoru corn wantyng* or *thoru were*; T similar; G, *Thoru corn wantyng euerayquer*.
Ibid. 25487, C, *Iesus, þat wald after mid-night, Di swete face, þat was sa bright, With luus spitting fire* G has the same reading.
- 1303 Rob. of Brunne, *Handl. S.* 3749ff., *ȝif þou for yre a man slogh*
Dat hyt was nat þe defendyng, But for wrapþe and yre brennyng
(þe = thyself).
- a. 1400 *Stanzaic Life of Chr.* 909ff., *And þat was showet apertly by temples and images falling down in Rome*.
Ibid., 1953ff., *hem nedet tokening Er that thay shuld thider go, As thay hade by the sterre shynyng*.
Ibid., 4673ff., *Who-soeuer this story all wold see Of the lewes azayne-comyng from Babiloyne to her cuntre in Ester he schal fynd this thyng*.
Ibid., 7317f., *The fite by dropes rennyng down on the side (i.e. the fifth proof showing that Christ rose in the same body that died)*.
Ibid., 10113f., *þe fyrst songe made no sowene After the first sowene doun comyng*.
- c. 1400 *Sowd. of Bab.* 2661 I am ful gladde of here comyng.
- beg. 15th c. *St. Jerome, Anglia* III, 357. 131ff., *What dome god sent from heuen apon this monastorye turnyng away thayre fface fro him*.
- beg. 15th c. *Prose Legends, Anglia* IV, 118. 16f., *Antony putte befor hys hene (= eyes) þe bytternes of wormes bytyng*.
- c. 1420 *St. Editha*, 3139f., *þis miracle was þus at Wyltone y-do In þe astere after hurre body dyenge*.
- c. 1420 *St. Ethelreda* 1705f., *so was þe sweuene of his suster seynt Ede Of hurre ryȝt yȝe ouȝt of here hedde fallyng*.
Ibid., 2090f., *Gret noyse men myȝt þo here Of clerkus & religiose wepyng*.
- c. 1440 *Generydes*, 448, *Ye gaue it hir attē your bothe departyng*. — *Ibid.* 5672, *Aft your both departyng*.
Ibid., 1284, *Of hir comyng the peopill were full fayn*.
- 1446 Bokenam, *Legends* 144, 721, *Of here þedyrgoyng þis was the entent*.

- c. 1450 *St. Cuthbert* 907, *Þai were glad of hir commyng.*
 1450 *Paston L. No. 117*, rather thanne he shuld fayle of a shiref this
yeer comyng for his entent he wole spende m^l li.
 a. 1480 *Monk of Evesh.* (Arber), p. 80, by her consenting al the state
 of crystyndome almoste ys ouercome.
 1528 Roy and Barlowe, *Rede me* (Arber), p. 31, Their vyces opened, they
could not abyde shame drevynge them to confusion.
 1536 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, I, II, CXXV, it was true of this light contynuyng
 from day to daye.
 c. 1550 Heywood, *Weather*, 141, Whose husbande departyd wythout her
 wyttyngye.
 1553 Eden, *The newe India* (Arber), p. 41, At Columbus first comming
 thether, the inhabitantes went naked.
 1584 *Presbyterian Movement* (Camden Soc.), p. 36, Mr. Tay moued whether
 the Churches shuld not ioigne in supplication wth others being a duty
 in them to saie for their pastors being faithfull.
 1585 *Ibid.* p. 53, Mr D. Chapman spoke of the Clothiers setting their
 Woodfats on the Sabbath daie.
 1589 Cooper, *Admonition* (Arber), p. 36, That (scil. libel) of the Spaniards
 (plural!) stealing him away is foolish and ridiculous.
 1592 Queen Elizabeth, *Letters Qu. El. and King James VI* (Camden Soc.),
 p. 74, if wisdom and princely authority be not by you used to prevent
perilles appearing, we have cause to doubt of greater danger to followe.
 1601 *Archpriest Controv.* (Camden Soc.) I, p. 191, many of the other side
 did far exceede them in all setting their presumptuous mindes and
 busie heades aside.
 1613 *Henstowe Papers*, 76.8, this note shall suffice to acknowledg my self
 indebted to y^u wth my q^ters rent 8^l for which y^u shall eather hav the
 whole companies bonds to pay y^u the first day of my play being playd,
 or the kings men shall pay it y^u & take my papers:
 1614 *Ibid.*, 125.51, if the said Robert Dawes shal be consenting
 [. . . . or privy to any other of the said company going out of the
 howse with any of their apparell on his or their bodies, he the said]
 Robert Dawes shall and will forfeit
 1625/6 *Diary Walter Yonge* (Camden Soc.) p. 91, Whether recusants be
 not borne out by reason of the Dukes mother and father-in-law being
 known papists (one of the questions put by Parliament to the Duke
 of Buckingham).
 1628 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, I, III, CCCXL (p. 258), wee had the charge of
 keeping him from any comming to him untill a guard of musketeers
 was brought.
 1641 *Verney's Notes Long Parl.* (Camden Soc.) p. 99, Hee knowes nothing
 of any French forces coming to Portsmouth.
Ibid. p. 123, we have often complained of lords being away.
 1686 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, IV, CCCXXXI (p. 92), Those Lords keeping
 thus out of town puts us both out of our way.
 1688 Id., *Ibid.* II, IV, CCCXLVII, What is said of four soldiers having
 shot at Father Peters in the Camp, is false.

17. If Jespersen's explanation of the origin of the *B*-type were right, constructions like those illustrated above would have required some time to exercise their influence upon English syntax before they could give rise to another construction, which could hardly have made its appearance until the "older" idiom had become firmly established. The *B*-type, however, occurs quite as early as the one to which, according to Jespersen, it owes its origin.

- a. 1300 *North Eng. Leg.* 140.185ff., *Þe apostels wend þai so to stroy. Bot*
unto þam þai might noht nol. At þe apostell biding sone þai went.
Cf. Ibid. 140.214, *at the Dukes prayng.*
 1338 Rob. of Brunne, *Chron.* 682, *For the quene comynge* he was fol glad.
 a. 1349 Hampole, *Pr. of Cons.* 1952f. And what es mare uncertayn thyng,
þan es þe tyme of the dede commyng. Cf. *Ibid.* 1969, *þe dedes com-*
myng; 1971 of dedys commyng, etc.
 Id., *Ibid.* 3994ff., *sere takens sal com, of whilk men may here fynd*
wreten some, Als of ancrist (Harl. MS. *Antecrist*) *commyng*, and his
 pouste. Cf. *Ibid.* 4407 *anticristes lawe.*

- c. 1350 *Arthur and Merlin* 513lf., Lete we now ben her cominge, & speke we of *þe children figting*.
- 1350—1400 *Emare* 973ff., *Emare* thawȝte her sone ȝynge A-ȝeyn *þe emperour komyng* How þat he sholde done.
- a. 1375 *Altengl. Leg.* (Horstmann), 6.147f., heo was ofte seke *for hire children departynge*.
- a. 1400 *Towneley Pl.* 272.458f., The fyrst cause, moder, of my comnyng, Was for mankynde myscaryng.
- a. 1400 *Stanzaic Life of Christ*, 6285, Crist was made obedient at his fader bidding.
- Ibid.* 7321ff., As rede *þe* dropes wer rennyng quan he was risen *þe* Prid day As thai war at his gost endyng.
- Ibid.* 7661ff., and this shoyng to sayn Thomas betokenes *men mysse-belevyng and dredyng* right as Thomas.
- Ibid.* 10153ff., And þat shwed (sic!) wel be one thyng þat *þe* Apostels vreden her After *þe Holy Gost comyng*.
- beg. 15th c. *St. Jerome, Anglia* III, 337.30, The day of *seint Jerome passing*, at complyne-tyme, the said Severe was in his owne house.
- c. 1410 *Lanterne of Light*, 32.13, holi chirche þat was chosen bi vertu of *þe Hooli Goost halowing*.
- c. 1420 *St. Editha*, 2165ff., He dude not lyȝe as don many other wymmen þat atte hurre children dyenge wepon fulle sore.
- c. 1450 *St. Cuthbert*, 743ff., *þe* comoun opynyng and telling Fra yreland of *cuthbert wending* hated and despysed was he (i. e. of Cuthbert's going from Ireland).
- 1459 *Pecock. Repr.*, p. 369, They schulden be punysched or vnpossessid in her procuratour or attorney occupiying now the godis.
- 1461 *Paston L.*, No. 386, sone upon the chef baron comyng I schall send you a lettre.
- 1461 *Ibid.* No. 392, It were right wele don ye awayted upon *hes man comyng*.
- 1469 *Ibid.* No. 619, and as for my Lord Archbyshop wrytyng and answeare, such as it shalbe, ye shall have it.
- 1470 *Ibid.* No. 646, they kepe other rewle that the contre is full sory and irk of, and of my lordes men resortyng to hem.
- 1479 *Ibid.* No. 845, Item, for the costes of John Paston rydyng to kepe the coort at Cressingham iij. iiij.
- 1484—'5 *Plumpton Corr.* p. 46, My nephew Halnath hath bene with me, and shewed to me a wyll made upon a fement, at my brother Sir John goyng over see.
- * c. 1515 *Ibid.*, p. 215, I pray you let me have the dayt of the marraige of my cosyn Hair and your daughter and ye thus doing bynds me to doe you as great a pleasure.
- * c. 1520? *Ibid.*, p. 225, he told me againe, that he put no dought but that ye would be good and foverrable to me. Sir, ye so being shall bind me, to my litle power, to do you pleasure.¹⁾
- c. 1525 *Ellis, Orig. Letters*, III, II, CXXXV, p. 33, no man wil deliuer to the said Collectors any parte of the loone to the Kings vse without his Grace writing.
- Cf. the genitive *Graces* 4 lines higher up and 3 lines lower down on the same page.
- c. 1527 *Id.*, *Ibid.*, III, II, CXLVII, *Syns your Grace departinge* ther hath been here great assemblies and bushments of persons suspect of felony.²⁾
- 1540—'50 *Heywood, Love*, 1567ff., Which lorde of lordes whose ioyfull and blessed byrth is now remembred by tyme presentyng This accustomed tyme of honest myrth.
- * 1549 *Latimer, Seven Sermons* (Arber), p. 160, I woulde haue no mans honestye empayred by me tellynge.
- c. 1550 *Heywood, Weather*, 137f., And for my name reportyng alwaye trewly What hurte to reporte a sad mater merely (= merrily).
- 1577 *Ellis, Orig. Letters*, II, III, CCII, and then (as the maner is) we fell a talking from on matter to an other untill we came to your Lordship being at Buckstons.

^{1,2)} This quotation and the preceding one have been taken from letters written by different persons.

- 1585 *Leycester Corr.* (Camden Soc.) p. 32, these people here dowbtyd
of hir majesty dealing thus with the king of Spayn.
- * 1589 Puttenham, *Engl. Poesie* (Arber), p. 172, I trust they will beare *with
me writing* in the vulgar speach.
- 1599 *Archpr. Controv.* (Camden Soc.), I, 220, yt may pertayne eyther *to
England, Scotland or Spaine intending* to make Calvins platforme,
Machiavels prince, & Dolemans succession, but all 3 words of one
signification.
- * 1601 *Ibid.*, I, 185, I will therefore first shew that they had no such
ignorance that *could excuse them admittinge* that he was a superior.
- 1602 *Ibid.*, II, 36, here yt was a world to see how the busie head off ffa.
Parsons bestirred him in spreadinge false rumo's *concerninge the
Queene of England persecutinge* preists & Catholicks.
- 1641 *Verney's Notes Long Parl.* (Camden Soc.), p. 115, The Lords sent
us the Scottish commissioners answere in writing which was *the
Kinge going* could not be defferd.
- 1645 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, III, IV, DL (p. 250), they fell to the attacking
of Newarke on the towne side also, which gave the Major the first
notice *of the towne being taken*.
- 1684—5 *Id.*, *Ibid.*, I, III, CCCLXXXII (p. 339), we are much comforted with
the hopes *of our Church continuing* in its former flourishing state. Cf.
Id., *Ibid.*, II, IV, CCCLXXXVII (p. 205), they sang a Te Deum *for the
Church's having lost* a Kingdom (date 1690).
- 1686 *Id.*, *Ibid.*, II, IV, CCCXXXI (p. 91), It will end *in his Grace becoming
Commander of Scotland*.
- 1686 *Trelawney Papers* (Camden Misc. II), p. 17, we dayly expected,
upon Monmouth moving eastward, orders to follow him.
- 1688 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, IV, CCCXLV (p. 115), What is said *of the
Prince of Orange having sent* five Dutch Men of War. . . . is very
uncertain. Cf. *Id.*, *Ibid.*, II, IV, CCCLXII, Some tell us *of the Prince
of Orange's being sick* (same date).

18. In a few cases I have felt some hesitation as to whether a quotation given in the second group, does not really belong to the first series. This, however, is of minor importance; even if two or three instances ought to be transferred from the second to the first group, the number of *B*-type examples left will be amply sufficient to show that the *B* construction was in use long before 1700.

It may be objected that the quotations from northern sources, particularly from early ones, are not conclusive, because in the North the common case often did duty for the genitive. This objection, however, is to a great extent invalidated by the circumstance that even in the North the genitive, and not the common case, is usually found before the gerund.

19. Among the examples given there are five (marked with an asterisk), in which we find the nominative or the objective of a personal pronoun. To these may be added three examples from Caxton, quoted by Kellner, *Syntax*, p. 263; '*pardon me so presumyng*'; 'take no displaysure *on me* so *presumyng*', 'take no displaysure *at me* so *presuming*'. There is no reason for considering them a special variety of the *B* type, the noun in the *B* type construction being functionally also either a nominative or an objective with regard to the rest of the sentence.

20. There is no construction in Old English that can be regarded as the germ of type *B*. The subjective genitive + gerund, which is found fairly frequently in O.E., is represented by the same construction in Middle and Modern English. Some genitives have no distinctive ending in the southern and S.W. Midland dialect — *a nelde prikinge* (*Ancr. R.* p. 184 and p. 282); *mid dogge uawenunge* (*Ibid.* p. 290); *heorte bireusunke* (*Lamb. H.*, p. 49); *mid herte bireowsunge* (*Ancr. R.* p. 370); *soule browunge* (*Ibid.* p. 372), but these few instances are of no real importance, as in the other dialects the

genitive singular of practically all nouns gradually adopted the ending *-es*.

21. In one case the O. E. gen. + gerund would give rise to a type *B* construction in M. E., namely if the genitive was in the plural, as, *butan þæra engla blawing* (Ælfr. Hom. II, 568) > **buten þe engles blowing*; cf. also *mid his handa hrepunge* (Ælfr. Hom. I, 122 and Id. *Lives of S.* 104.234); *þurh ðæra sacerda blawunge* (Id. Hom. II, 216); *be þæra fingra fremminge* (Id. *Ibid.* II, 204); *æfter minra biscopa tæcinge* (Earle, *Handb. Land Charters* 230.22); *þurh haligra boca tæcunge* (Assmann, *Hom.* 144,2).

It is, however, extremely doubtful whether such constructions as *by temples and images falling*, quoted in section 16, which may have developed spontaneously, would have such a far-reaching influence as to give rise to an entirely new construction. It does not seem likely either that type *B* owes its origin to the analogy of type *A*; the two types being too widely different in meaning for one to affect the other.

22. That the causes enumerated by Jespersen have to be rejected, has been observed in section 17.

Nothing, consequently, remains but to assume that type *B* is an imitation of an Old French construction, examples of which are given by Einkenkel, *Anglia* XXXVIII, p. 67.50 and *Gesch. der hist. Engl. Syntax*, p. 10. The construction is found in Anglo-Norman, too.

Amis e Amil. 697 f., *l'endemain a tierce sonant* Tuz i vindrent.
Cron. de London, p. 74, *le roy vint a Loundres deuant le*
qaremmie pernaunt, et illoques demorra.

Einkenkel quotes *apres le nofme duc regnant*.

23. In at least one case it is quite evident that an Anglo-Norman idiom was imitated, or rather, translated; I mean the O. F. *le soleil levant, le soleil colchant*, and M. E. *þe sonne rising, þe sonne going down*. Jespersen, l. c. p. 155, says with reference to the M. E. idioms "I am unable to see in them anything but compounds", and draws attention to the "compounds exemplified in *N. E. D.* from 1440: *sonne arysing, sonne goyng down*". He goes on to say "They have nothing to do with the nexus-construction dealt with in this paper". I hope to show that they have a good deal to do with it.

24. It is curious that from Blume, *Über den Ursprung und die Entwicklung des Gerundiums im Englischen* (1880), p. 5 and p. 13, onwards, one constantly finds the same two or three examples of the idiom in question quoted. Very little attention has evidently been paid to it until now, for the idiom is by no means rare in Middle and early Modern English.

25. As has been said, we have to start from O. F. *le soleil levant, le soleil colchant*. This idiom occurs in two constructions, *a.* as an absolute participial construction; *b.* preceded by a preposition. — I will only give instances from A. N. texts.

Construction *a.*

- 1375 Rymer, *Fædera* VII, 52, *a durer meismes les Trieues & Abstinences, du jour par vous a limiter, tanque au jour de Pasque prochain a venir, soleil levant.*

Id. *Ibid.* VII, 59, *tanque al jour de Pasque prochain venir, solail levant.*

Id. *Ibid.* VII, 81, *jusques au darrein jour de Juyn, soleil levant.*

- 1376 Id. *Ibid.* VII, 105, *tanque au darrein jour de Juyn, prochain venant, soleil levant.*

No instances of *soleil colchant* in this construction have been found so far.

Construction b.

- 1285 *Statute of Winchester* (Stubbs, *Sel. Charters*), IV, 471, le rey comaunde qe les portes soient fermes del solail rescuse *au solail levaunt* e facent la veille continuelement tute la nuit del solail rescuse *jeques al solail leuaunt*.
 1333 Rymer, *Fædera* IV, 564, 565, 566, 567 (twice) *au solail levant*.
 Id. *Ibid.* IV, 565 and again 567, *entre le solail levant & le Solail recoursant*.
 1340 Id. *Ibid.* V, 206 and again 209 *jesques al solail levaunt*.
 a. 1344 *Cron. de London*, p. 85, le jour seint Andreu, *au soleil levant*.
 1348 Rymer, *Fædera* V, 636, a l'Eur *de solail couchant* a l'Eure dessus ditte *de soleil couchant*.
 1361 Id. *Ibid.* VI, 312 *au solail couchant*; 321, *au solail couchantz*.
 1376 Id. *Ibid.* VII, 100, 101, 107, *heure de solail levant*.

26. Both Anglo-Norman constructions have their equivalents in Middle English. The first does not seem to occur early, and I can only quote the following examples.

- 1386 Rymer, *Fædera*, VII 526 (Scotch), fra the makyng of yis Endentures to the last day of May next comand, *the sone gangand to Rest*.
 1404 Id. *Ibid.* VIII, 363, fro the twentyth day of this presente Moneth of Juyl, *the Sunne rysyng*, until the day of Pasque next folewand, *the Sonne goyng down*.
 1408 Id. *Ibid.* VIII, 539, fro to the Feste of Pasque next that after cummyng *the sonne going doune*.

That in these combinations we have a present participle, and not a gerund, is self-evident.

27. Before proceeding to a discussion of the other construction, I will give a number of instances.

- c. 1250 *Kent. Serm.*, O.E. Misc., p. 26, We redeth *þet si sterre swo apierede to þo þrie kinges of heþenesse þo sunne risindde*.
 a. 1300 *King Horn*, 847 (O), To morwe schal be *þe fyȝtyng At þe sonne op rysyng*.
 c. 1300 *King Alys*. 2901, Mury hit is *in sonne rising*.
 1338 Rob. of Brunne, *Chron.* 1190, at morn yn *the sonne rysyng*.
 Id., *Ibid.* 9237, To morn *atte sonne rysyng*.
 a. 1349 Hampole, *Pr. of Consc.* 4778 f., *þat sal last fra the son rysyng Tiil þe tyme of the son doungangyng*.
 c. 1350 *Prose Psalter*, XLIX. 2, From *the sonne arisyng vn-to þe going adoune*.
 c. 1375 Barbour, *Bruce*, XI, 37, On [sunday than] in the morning, Weill soyn *eftir the sonne-Rising*.
 Id. *Ibid.* XII, 212, we, *be the sonne-rysyng*, Haf herd mes.
 Id. *Ibid.* XIV, 166, soyn *after the sone-rysyng*; XIV, 205, soyn *eftir the sone-rysyng*.
 a. 1380 Wyclif, *Sel. Wks.*, I, 131, And eerly on *þe Sonnenday Þei comen to þe sepulcre of Crist, at þe sunne rysyng*.
 c. 1382 Id., *Gen.* XXVIII, 11, he wolde rest in it *after the sunne goyng down*.
 Id. *Josh.* XII, 1, *At the sonne arisyng*.
 beg. 15th c. *St. Antony* (*Anglia* IV), 119. 14, ones he ete in *þe day, & þat after þe sone goyng doune*.
 a. 1440 *Prose Life Alex.* 90. 4 ff., *þai began to spryng vp at the son rysyng*. And *bi þe son settyng* þay wyted a-way in-to *þe erthe agayne* And *by þe son settyng* þay ware in *þe erthe agayne*.
 1464 Rymer, *Fædera*, XI, 523, The seid Treues to endure *to the sonne goyng down* the First Day of Octobre then next suyng.
 1481 Caxton, *Godfrey*, CXXXVII. 205. That alle man shold be in the mornyng *tofore the sonne rysyng* alle armed (O.E.D.)

28. The instance from the *Kentish Sermons*, in which the present participle is found instead of the gerund, is not quite so strange as it looks at first sight; both in the southern and in the northern dialect the participle sometimes does duty for the gerund.

Is the idiom to be considered a compound? If it is, all other combinations of the same kind, including *Miss Sharp appearing* must be called compounds, for there is no difference in construction between *after þe Holy Gost comyng* and *after þe sunne goyng down*, between *of seint Jerome passing* and *of the son doungangyng*.

The verbal sense of the gerund after *sun* may sometimes have become obscured, as in 'We seke to ferre towards þe son rysyng' (*Prose Life Alex.*, 76.20), where 'þe son rysyng' means 'the East'; in such a case the appellation 'compound' might be justifiable. Generally speaking, however, this term would be a misnomer, which would ignore the origin of the construction. Nobody would think of calling *au soleil levant* a compound.

29. In Middle English, just as in Modern English, the type *B* construction has the same meaning as the genitive + gerund and the gerund + of + common case. In Hampole's *Pr. of Consc.* we find *the dede commyng* (1953), *þe dedes commyng* (1968, 1971, 1997, 2167) and *þe commyng of þe dede* (2015). There is the same alternation in the case of *the sun rising*.

- c. 1300. *King Alys*. 2901 Laud MS., Mury hit is in sonnes risyng' (*O.E.D.*).
- 1449. Pecock, *Repressor*, p. 224, he (Jacob) came after the sunnys going doun into a place in which he leide him doun.
- a. 1349. Hampole, Psalm XLIX, 2 and CXII, 3 ffra (fra) the risyng' (rysyng) of the sone (sun).
- c. 1350. *Prose Ps.* CXII, 3, Dublin MS., fram þe rysyng of þe sune vnto the going doun.
- c. 1350. *Ipom.*, A, 5760f., There dyed many a man sore Be rysyng' of the sune.
- 1381. Purvey, *Gen.* XXVIII, II, aftir the goyng down of the sunne; cf. Wyclif, after the sunne goyng down.
- 1381—88. Hereford and Purvey, *Ps.* XLIX, 2 and CXII, 2, fro the risyng' of the sonne til the goyng doun.
- c. 1388. Chaucer, *Cant. T.* F, 1487, And knew the arysing of his mone weel.
- c. 1391. Id., *Astrol.* II, 12, 2, fro the arysing of the sonne.
- 1463. Rymer, *Fœdera*, XI, 508, the XV Day of November, then next ensuing, at the Rysing of the sonne.
- 1464. Id., *Ibid.*, XI, 509, To endure into the First Day of Octobre next comyng, till the Goeing downe of the sonne.

30. These quotations, compared with the instances of the *B* type construction given higher up, show that the fourteenth and fifteenth century Englishman knew that *the sun rising* consisted of *the sun* + *rising*. In other words: The article belongs to *sun*, and not to *sun rising*. The combination was not felt to be a compound, any more than *the barrel leaking* in 'A lot of wine was lost through the barrel leaking' is regarded as a compound by the present-day Englishman.

Compounds consisting of subject + gerund have always been rare in English; it is very doubtful whether they existed at all in Middle English.

31. After what has been said about the *B* type, it need hardly be insisted on that it is a construction of a special grammatical nature, and not a degenerated genitive + gerund. The latter construction — 'I object to my boy's having anything to do with that lad' — is English; it can be traced back through M. E. to O. E., whereas the *B* type is probably of French origin.

32. The construction consisting of a possessive pronoun + gerund — 'I don't mind his using my pen' — is much older than the construction in which a personal pronoun is the subject of the gerund — 'I don't mind

him using my pen' —. It may be worth noting, however, that 'I don't mind its being late' is comparatively recent, the reason being that *its* did not make its appearance till about 1600; *its* was, however, only sparingly used in the first half of the 17th century. As regards *its* + gerund, the earliest instance I have found dates from 1688: The report of *its appearing* upon our Coast was a mistake (*its* refers to the Dutch fleet), Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, IV, CCCLIII. There is an earlier one, dated 1679, in Arber, *Term Catalogues*, I, 346: the reason of *its not being* accordingly performed, was . . . — I have noted eight more dating from 1691 to 1711.

33. On p. 91f. of *English Studies* IX Dr. Kruisinga quotes a few late sixteenth and seventeenth century examples of constructions of the type 'to hinder it from happening'. He does not mention 'to prevent it happening'. This type probably existed as early as the end of the sixteenth century, although I cannot adduce an instance. My surmise is based on a quotation from one of Queen Elizabeth's letters, given in section 16: *to prevent perilles appearing* (date 1592). If the perils had been mentioned before, Queen Elizabeth might have written 'to prevent them appearing', or 'to prevent it appearing', if her mind had been occupied with one peril. As will be seen from the instances given in section 17 (see also section 19), the construction in which the personal pronoun is the subject of the gerund is not so recent as Dr. Kruisinga seems inclined to think (l. c. p. 92).

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

Addendum. The following example may be added to those given in section 6:

Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem, 693ff., ic me ne ondred þæt me þæra ænig beswice. For þon þær næs riht on þære stowe ænigne to acwellanne for þære stowe weorþunge.

Notes and News.

The Oxford Dictionary. Most of our readers, even those who are not subscribers to the Oxford Dictionary, will have heard that the dictionary has been completed by the appearance of the last instalment in April of this year. The Oxford University Press is evidently carrying on a systematic propaganda to create a general interest in the work which is more likely to appeal to outsiders now that it is complete. To scholars, of course, it has for many years been one of the most indispensable books of reference. We congratulate those who have had the pleasure of surviving the completion of the task to which they have devoted many years of their lives. Of them it may without exaggeration be said that "they have well deserved of their country." For a dictionary like the Oxford one is possible only in a country that has reached a high standard of culture. It is also important to observe that among the modern successors of Dr. Johnson there are a number of Scotchmen, a fact which it is to be hoped will not disturb the spirit of the great lexicographer of the eighteenth century. It certainly does not disturb the present generation, although it is an interesting result of the neglect of English language-study in England that the first chief editor, Dr. Murray, had to be supplied by Scotland, and that far more than half of the work has been done by him and Dr. Craigie. We can look upon the dictionary, therefore, as a monument of the cooperation of Scotch and English scholarship.

International Congress of Linguists. The First International Congress of Linguists, which met at The Hague, April 10-15, was well attended by scholars from practically every country of Europe. Most American linguists were probably debarred by the length of the voyage, and by the circumstance that the dates of the Congress fell just in the middle of their second academic term. No such consideration can account for the exceedingly small number of English linguists present, nor for the fact that among specialists in modern European languages students of English were far less numerous than those of Romance, continental Germanic or Slavonic languages.

The Transactions of the Congress will be published in due course. The next Congress will be held in 1931.

Prijsvraag Groningse Universiteit. Rector en senaat der universiteit te Groningen hebben o.a. de volgende prijsvraag uitgeschreven voor studerenden aan een Nederlandse instelling van hoger onderwijs:

De faculteit (der letteren en wijsbegeerte) verlangt een verhandeling over de mogelijke invloed op het gebied van woordgebruik, bouw en karaktertekening, die „The true Chronicle History of King Leir and his three Daughters” gehad kan hebben op Shakespeare's „King Lear”, waarbij in het bijzonder moet worden gelet op de oudere vormen van de sage van King Lear.

De vraag moet worden beantwoord in de taal waarin zij gesteld is. Het antwoord, geschreven met een andere hand dan die van de auteur of met een schrijfmachine, moet vóór 1 Mei 1929 worden toegezonden aan de secretaris van de senaat der universiteit. Het moet worden getekend met een spreuk en vergezeld gaan van een gesloten en verzegeld briefje, dat dezelfde spreuk tot opschrift heeft en de naam en het adres van de schrijver bevat. Op de derde Maandag van de maand September 1929 wordt het oordeel van de faculteit over de ingekomen verhandelingen afgekondigd en aan de schrijver van het meest voldoende antwoord, dat door de faculteit de bekroning is waardig gekeurd, de gouden erepenning uitgereikt.

(N. R. C.)

Points of Modern English Syntax.

316. Never mention this again for your own sake — you will stay here until I wish you to go. Walpole, *Fortitude* I, ch. IX, IV, p. 109.

What is the function of *will* here? Hdbk. 128. Is the function to be explained as a development from the original meaning of *will*? See the note on *Language* in the number of December last (p. 213).

317. Looking back afterwards, he was to see that that evening with Stephen flung him on to all the events that so rapidly followed. *ib.* I, ch. VIII, p. 86.

What is the function of *was to see*? Hdbk. 138a.

318. It was this knowledge that made me so idle and so indifferent to saving; and it was this small income that has been, and is in a commercial sense, the ruin of my life. Davies, *Autobiography of a Super-Tramp*. ch. 17, p. 134.

Is the contrast between *has been* and *is* one of time? Hdbk. 142, and the Dec. number of this periodical p. 202 (on *is changed or changing*).

319. “Bring your chair close up to the bed — so — like that. You have never come to sit in here before, Peter, do you know that?”
“Yes, mother”

"You have come in before because you have been told to. To-day you were not told — why did you come?" Walpole, *Fortitude*, I, ch. VIII, III, p. 91.

Explain the use of the tenses here. It is contrary to special 'rules' often given in 'practical' grammars (e.g. the preterite must be used when past time is mentioned; and yet *before* accompanies a form with *have*). It will be found that the tenses are used according to the principles that really govern their use. Hdbk. 144.

320. He discovered that the sun rose about six o'clock, and therefore five o'clock on Easter morning found him shivering, in the desolate garden with his nose pressed to the little wooden gate. *ib.* I, ch. X, III, p. 118.

Explain the function of the preterite *rose*. Hdbk. 153 and 89.

321. 1) The man dropped without a word and lay motionless, *ib.* I, ch. I, III, p. 14.
He did not look at the body again, but when he had recovered a little, still without a word to any one and with his eyes grave and without expression, he moved to the corner where his clothes lay. *ib.* p. 14.

2) Stephen was sitting on one of the beds, looking in front of him. Peter moved forward heavily and sat on the other bed. *ib.* II, ch. VIII, II, p. 226.
Then he knew that there was a pause, he caught a glimpse of the brick floor and he saw that Stephen was sitting back in his chair . . .

The man dropped without a word and lay motionless. It was over. Stephen gravely watched for a moment the senseless body, and then sat back in his chair, his head bowed on his chest. *ib.* p. 14.

3) She put it on the table and then stood beside him, crying pitifully . . .
ib. I, ch. IX, p. 98.

He got up from his chair and made her sit down on it and then he stood by her and waited until she should recover a little. *ib.* *ib.*

Define the aspects of the verbs *to lie*, *sit*, and *stand* here. Hdbk. 161 ff, especially 168.

322. Quietly, as though he were reciting the story to himself and were not sure whether he were telling it aloud or no, he began. As he continued she could see the place as though it was there with her in the room. *ib.* I, ch. I, III, p. 159.

Explain the functions of the subjunctive *were* used here three times running; and the use of *was* in an apparently identical case in the last sentence. Hdbk. 236 and 242.

323. She was really going to get up, though, that was flat! The fire would blaze directly, although at this moment it was blowing wood-smoke down Jane's throat, and making her choke.

Directly was five minutes, but the fire did blaze up royally in the end. De Morgan, *Somehow Good*, ch. 5, p. 43.

What is the function of *did* in *did blaze up*? Hdbk. 252b.

324. A large number of towns had been granted, or rather sold, charters by Richard I and John. Pollard, *History of England* ch. 3, p. 61.

Explain the use of the construction with *to be*. Hdbk. 274.

325. Barbour might be reluctant to act, but act he must. Walpole, *Fortitude* I, ch. VI, III, p. 73.

What form is *act* in the last sentence? Hdbk. 291.

326. Look at it as he might, he had been a failure at Dawson's. *ib.* p. 76.

But the boy knew when he met him again, sober this time, by the sad look in his eyes, that Stephen must go his way alone now, lead him where it would. *ib.* I, ch. VI, p. 63.

What forms are *look* and *lead*? Hdbk. 292f.

327. He didn't mean them to think he meant them to hear. de Morgan, *Somehow Good* ch. 26, p. 280.

What class of verbs construed with the acc. c. inf. does *mean* belong to here? Hdbk. 364.

328. For the third time that evening he had to fight against a disposition to blow his nose and be absurd. Walpole, *Fortitude* II, ch. V, p. 199.

It is usually, and quite correctly, stated that the second of two coordinated infinitives requiring *to* when used independently, need not repeat *to*. Hdbk. 316. Sometimes, as here, the repetition of *to* would be wrong; why?

329. . . . men who wanted no steady employment, but to make easy and quick stakes. Davies, *Super-Tramp*, ch. 13, p. 102.

What is the function of *to make* here? Hdbk. 336.

330. She trusted to them to make the arrangements concerning her will. *Memoirs Verney Family* I, p. 243.

As he reminds us in the introduction, he was singularly fortunate in his advisers; he could depend on them to interpret with full knowledge and insight the wishes and points of view of other countries. *Times Lit. Suppl.* 1/10, 1925.

It was indeed of the greatest advantage that during these ten years Lord Grey had to work with men who knew this country so well as Cambon and Benckendorff; and he could rely on them to exercise a calming influence on any apprehensions that might arise in Paris or Petersburg. *ib.*

When a man of letters who is not by trade a writer of fiction surprises us late in his career with a first novel, as the editor of the *Spectator* does with the *Madonna of the Barricades*, we can generally count on the pleasure he took in writing it to give an exhilaration to its pages. *ib.* 8/10, 1925.

These quotations show that we must acknowledge the existence of a real prepositional acc. c. inf. with other prepositions than *for*. See Hdbk.

379. Note that these constructions are limited to verbs that can take a real adjunct with the same preposition, whereas *for* is used more freely.

331. The hopeless sound of the chubby one's crying caused Peter suddenly to go red hot somewhere inside his chest, and like a bullet from a gun he was into the middle of the circle. Walpole, *Fortitude*, I, ch. V, p. 52.

What is unusual about the use of *to be* expressing movement here? See Hdbk. 626, 1.

332. "Very likely he has a daughter my age", said she to herself. De Morgan, *Somehow Good* ch. 2, p. 11.

What is the function of *my age*, and when can a noun be used in that way? Hdbk. 876, 1b.

333. And, lonely, in his chairman's seat at the top end old Sylvanus Heythorp sat, with closed eyes, still and heavy as an image. Galsworthy, *Caravan*, p. 45.

Is *chairman's* an attributive adjunct? Hdbk. 903.

334. But for all that he was human, and English, and theoretically accepted gold as the thing of things, the one great aim and measure of success. De Morgan, *Somehow Good*, ch. 36, p. 385.

What is the function of the repetition of *thing* here? Hdbk. 1450.

335. As all evidence is wanting, we can only guess that the Saxon conquest was achieved by two distinct types of expedition. Trevelyan, *History of England* ch. 3, p. 35.

Account for the class-noun *expedition* being used without an article. Hdbk. 1453.

336. The former tramp up the road as best they can. *Times Weekly Ed.* 16/1, 1914.

What is the function of the superlative here?

337. Things seemed to him that day at their worst. Walpole, *Fortitude*, I, ch. VI, III, p. 72.

What part of speech is *worst* here? Note that the answer is the same for all the uses treated in Hdbk. 1539—43.

338. She was thrown off her guard by the finished execution, and for the moment quite forgot Cattley's and the classitudes. De Morgan, *Somehow Good*, ch. II, p. 103. (Cattley's: the shop where the violinist was an assistant; Classitudes: social distinctions between the classes of society).

Explain the formation of *classitudes*. Hdbk. 1816.

339. The tall man fighting such odds excited his unwilling admiration. Galsworthy, *Caravan*, p. 5.

Does *unwilling* 'qualify' *admiration* only? Hdbk. 1847, 1.

340. Descartes lived a wanderer in fear of persecution. Bailey, *A Question of Taste*, p. 10.

What part of the sentence is *a wanderer*? Hdbk. 1885a.

Reviews.

Medieval Studies in memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis.
Pp. xv + 535. Paris, Champion, and New-York, Columbia University Press, 1927.

Scholars from all sides have contributed to a memorial, inscribed to the spirit of one of their own ranks who was remarkable both for an original mind and refined scholarship. She had to go when life was still full of promise before her, and yet she never left her task unfinished. Her work on the Tristan romance is complete in itself, and it marks a new era in medievalistic research. No memorial was wanted to perpetuate her name among the coming generations of fellow-workers. Yet it is well to have erected this one. For, better than anything else, it goes to show how strongly her age was affected by her methods and her trend of thought. She is not one of those that passed away unnoticed.

A few contributions to the Schoepperle volume deal with subjects from Romance philology exclusively; for a criticism of these the present reviewer does not regard himself sufficiently qualified. Such are the papers by D. S. Blondheim ('Gleanings from the bible of Alva'), L. Foulet ('Villon et Charles d'Orléans'), Ch. Grandgent ('Rime and rhetoric in the Divine Comedy'), G. L. Hamilton ('The royal mark of the Merovingians and kindred phenomena'), L. Hibbard ('Malory's book of Balin'), L. Ropes Loomis ('The Greek studies of Poggio Bracciolini'), F. Patterson ('Hymnal from MS. Add. 34193, Br. Mus.'), M. Roques ('Correspondance de K. Bartsch et G. Paris de 1865 à 1885'), A. Thomas ('Sur une nouvelle étymologie de Chantepleure'), R. Weeks ('Le lai de l'Oiselet'). If they do not figure any more in the following pages, it is not because they should lack the interest which entitles the remaining studies in this beautiful volume to a closer survey. The reviewer, however, finds himself obliged to confine his remarks to the Celtic field, and even so there is an enormous variety of views and prospects before him.

It is but natural that the name of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis should have called forth a number of contributions on the Tristan romance. There is, for instance, a minute and psychologically subtle comparison of the notion of love in Tristan and Lancelot by M. Lot-Borodine, which leads towards the conclusion: 'Tristan représente l'amant éternel tel qu'il est, Lancelot c'est l'amant tel qu'il doit être'. The character of the love potion in the primitive Tristan romance is discussed by E. Vinaver. Was the influence of the love draught originally limited to a certain period, as Béroul and Eilhart have it, or does Thomas with his love potion of unabating power

preserve a primitive trait? Scholars have always been divided on this point. One can only agree with the view expressed here that, though the influence of the 'vin herbé' was not actually limited, it must have appeared so to the lovers themselves. For how would Tristan have found strength to restore Iseult to the king but for this illusion? Thus a new argument is developed in favour of the priority of the Bérout version. Less convincing is F. Ranke's assumption of a separate source for Thomas and the Bérout continuation on account of the scene of Iseult's ordeal and the ensuing discovery, which does not occur in the other versions. The argument is largely founded on the carvings of the ivory casket at St. Petersburg. Although the scene is, no doubt, justly derived from a current popular story, it seems hazardous to accept a special literary source for this casket (described by Loomis, *Romanic Review* VIII, 196 sqq.), as is proposed by Ranke. For the notions of the artist doubtless were of a compilatory character.

Another group of studies is devoted to Arthurian philology. Pio Rajna makes a lexicological and stylistic comparison between *De Ortu Walwanii* and *Historia Meriadoci*, and concludes that both works are by the same author. E. Brugger plunges once more into the jungle of Arthurian name-interpretation and makes an attempt at an etymology of the name given to Perceval's father in the prologue of certain manuscripts of the Grail romance (*Bliocadran*). A certain doubt may be expressed as to the possibility of retracing the origin of names of this type. At any rate the etymology proposed by Brugger is far from satisfactory. It is certainly very probable that *Bliocadrans* originated from a double name, whose first element was *Blios*. Now if *Blios* is justly identified by Brugger with *Brios* and *Brioc*, the form with *r* must represent the older stage as it cannot be separated from Irish *Bríán*. On the other hand, should we reject the above identification, and consider *Blios* as independent from *Brios*, then the interpretation of *Blios* as Welsh *blewog* (not *bleuog*!) 'hairy' still remains highly problematical, this common adjective never occurring in either modern or ancient writings as a personal name. The explanation given of the second element is even more fanciful. *Cadrans*, which is supposed to stand for an older *Cadroain* or *Cadoain*, is derived from a Welsh *cad-win* ('white in battle'?) or rather *cadr-win* ('strong and white'), and in both cases such a name would stamp its bearer as a hero from . . . fairyland and the Other World. Unfortunately the only possible translation of *cadwin* is either 'The White Battle' or 'Having a White Battle', which yields no good sense, while for a personal name consisting of two adjectives an analogue is wanting.

The views of R. S. Loomis on the antiquity of the Arthurian sculpture at Modena are well-known. In his contribution to the present volume he gives his full reasons for dating it between 1099 and 1106. Thus it would furnish an ante-Galfridian document of Arthurian legend, which would have reached Italy by the intermediary of France. All that can be said is that certainty on this most important subject may only be expected when students of architectural history will agree as to the exact date of the Modena archivolt. The interpretation of the scene represented on the sculpture also remains subject to suspicion; it is based on a number of not too characteristic points of comparison. The proofs adduced for the identification of Winlogge and Gwenhwyfar, for instance, hardly seem convincing.

To J. Douglas Bruce we are indebted for another paper on a subject from Arthurian legend, 'Mordred's Incestuous Birth'. Here it is shown that the notion of Mordred being born from incest did not rise until the *Mort Artu*, where Arthur and his sister Anna figure as his parents. The reason

advanced by Bruce for the introduction of this new *motif*, viz. the adoption of a superhuman power operating in a manner closely related to the tragic fate of the Greeks, is, however, altogether incompatible with the fundamental conceptions of medieval legend. The poet's object obviously was to enrich tradition by a popular *motif*, as yet absent from Arthurian legend, by making Arthur's final struggle with Mordred appear as a combat between father and son. Another point where I disagree with the writer is the interpretation of Geoffrey VIII, 21. From the passage quoted by Bruce on p. 200 it has been inferred by most commentators that according to Geoffrey Anna was married twice, to Leir and Lot successively. But none of them ever succeeded in establishing the identity of this Leir. Moreover, the subject of the phrase *erat autem consul ille* can only be Lot, to whom the passage as a whole refers. As a matter of fact, the only possible solution of the difficulty is to take *Leir* as a geographical name (= Caerleir, Leicester): 'Now he (Lot) was a consul of Leicester'.

From Arthurian legend it is not a long way to folklore. R. J. Peebles establishes the meaning of the tree with the children and the tree with the many lights, known from many versions of the Perceval. It is a life symbol from prehistoric times that left many traces in popular tales. Of course, one cannot expect to find a satisfactory explanation of this symbol in a paper of some fourteen pages. W. A. Nitze identifies Brons the Fisher King with the Welsh hero Bendigeit Vran. Although the question is yet in no way settled, one willingly agrees with the cautiously worded conclusion 'that the identification of Brons with the Celtic Bran is in every respect more plausible than the purely Christian explanation of the name proposed by Heinzel'. In an investigation of a methodically doubtful character M. W. Beckwith connects the stories of Peredur and Owein with a Punjab legend. All that is proved, however, is the similarity of current *motifs* in the literatures of the East and the West.

Old-Norse literature forms the subject of two papers. Eleanor Hull compares the *motif* of the dead warrior's spirit coming to tryst with his lady in the second Helgi Lay and an early Irish poem. It remains obscure how she could extract from these two texts more than a general likeness, which need not be accounted for by a historical relation. H. G. Leach puts the question whether the yet unpublished Gibbonssaga is a reflection of Partonopeus, and answers it in the negative.

Another branch of philology that receives its due share in the volume under consideration is Irish literature. In a valuable paper on King Arthur and the Grail, A. C. L. Brown compares the English Sir Perceval with certain stories in Irish, especially The Lad of the Ferule, edited by Douglas Hyde in the first volume of the Irish Texts Society. The chief argument goes to show that the Grail originated in the cup-of-plenty, so well-known in Irish tales of this type. This statement, of course, is amply justified by the facts. When, however, it is argued that Arthur originally was a fairy king, and his court and kingdom the realm of the *sidhe*, one finds oneself stirred to contradiction. If one of the numerous *motifs* of Arthurian legend was borrowed from the stores of fairy-lore, it does not follow that everything in this huge branch of medieval literature is Other World and nothing else.

An unpublished variant of an Irish text, the Birth of Brandub son of Eochaid and of Aedán son of Gabrán, is edited and translated by R. I. Best from the Yellow Book of Lecan. It contains an additional instance of the verb *fiuraim* 'I satisfy', for which the editor refers to Irische Texte III, 279, 545. The verb also occurs in Plummer, Irish Lives of Saints, vol. I,

p. 300. Douglas Hyde publishes a medieval account of Antichrist, which will interest folklorists. This curious piece of prose is characteristic for the popular conception of the monster that was to make its appearance in the latest age. It was largely built upon the well-known folklore pattern of Inversion in the Other World, and it recalls the description of Cuchulainn's contorsions in the Táin. Another text from the Yellow Book is given by O. J. Bergin ('How the Dagda got his magic staff'). As appears from the title it belongs to the mythological cycle.

The three remaining papers are of a more general interest. F. Lot examines the historical value of Gildas, which is very doubtful. Upon reading Lot's article one is inclined to put the question whether Gildas' silence on certain points, especially concerning the Saxon Conquest, is as significant as we usually reckon it to be. That one can be a linguist of high fame without losing all archaeological interests is proved by J. Vendryes, who contributes a study on the Abbey of Mellifont, not far from Drogheda. He shows that this famous abbey is the direct offspring of that of Clairvaux without an English intermediary. J. Fraser deals with an aspect of the Pictish question, left untouched by him in his earlier writings. Zimmer was the first to declare that one of the institutions characteristic for the Pictish people was the existence of Matriarchy. After him this doctrine was repeated by many others, although they never fixed the exact type of matriarchy. Fraser states that the normal way of succession among the Picts was through the male, and that they had no custom connected with succession which differed generically from those in Britain or Ireland. Thus the foundations of the pre-Indoeuropean theory concerning the Picts are sensibly shaken.

Reviewing a volume with contents of so diverse a character is no easy task. However, the reviewer will be fully satisfied if he has succeeded in giving the reader the impression that here there is not only *multa* but *multum*, and that the volume is in no way unworthy of the name that honours its title-page.

Utrecht.

A. G. VAN HAMEL.

Seneca his Tenne Tragedies translated into English, edited by THOMAS NEWTON anno 1581. With an Introduction by T. S. ELIOT. London, Constable, 1927. (The Tudor Translations, Second Series. Edited by CHARLES WHIBLEY, XI-XII). Two vols.: I. pp. liv + 232; II. pp. 258. 42/- net.

Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca. (An Address read before the Shakespeare Association, 18th March, 1927.) By T. S. ELIOT. London, publ. for the Shakespeare Association, Milford, 1927. Pp. 18. 2/- net.

Both in his introduction to Newton's *Seneca* and in the address read before the Shakespeare Association, T. S. Eliot, with that accustomed sureness of grasp which secures him a place second to no other among contemporary English literary critics, has seized the essential points concerning the influence of Seneca on Elizabethan drama. For the remarkable results he has reached, he is partly under obligation to the scholars (chiefly J. W. Cunliffe; and L. E. Kastner and H. B. Charlton¹) who have exhaustively

¹ In the Introduction to *The Poetical Works of Sir William Alexander*, Vol. I. Manchester University Press, 1921, pp. ccxx + 482.

studied before him the influence of Seneca in its formal aspect; but in the main he owes those results to the wide range of his own information, which has allowed him to throw on this particular subject a light deriving from related studies.

How far is Seneca responsible for the horrors which disfigure Elizabethan drama? How far is he responsible for *bombast* in Elizabethan diction? What is his influence upon the *thought*, or what passes for thought, in the drama of Shakespeare and his contemporaries? These are the main points on which Mr. Eliot has concentrated his attention. As for the first point, F. S. Boas, in his introduction to the *Works* of Kyd (p. xxxv) had already noticed how receptive was the soil on which fell the Seneca revenge *motif*, with the concomitant horrors: the Renaissance, with its realistic and anarchical impulses, had again laid bare those primitive instincts which the feudal code of manners — Boas assumes — had partly hidden. Seneca — writes Mr. Eliot — provided the dramatist with a pretext or justification for horrors for which (owing to the ethical 'reversion to type' described by Boas) there was certainly a taste. Plays like *The Yorkshire Tragedy* and *Arden of Feversham*, though posterior to *The Spanish Tragedy* (which is clearly indebted to Seneca¹) cannot be traced to foreign or classical influence, but are the direct outcome of a lively public interest in police court horrors of the time. Such interest is perhaps nowhere better attested than in Nashe's *Unfortunate Traveller*, with its sensationalism continually overreaching itself in the display of horrors piled upon horrors, and its iterated showman's cries: "Prepare your eares and your teares, for never tyll thys thrust I anie tragedie matter upon you" . . . I will show further on how the English translators of the *Tenne Tragedies* were enabled to enlarge on Seneca's horrors by a native taste for loathsome details; but in this unpleasant feature they had been anticipated by the Italian imitators of Seneca. Conclusive evidence on this latter point is given in Kastner's and Charlton's essay: it was Giraldis Cinthio who first interpreted as *horrore* the φῶβος Aristotle required for tragedy, and who gave to the Thyestean banquet that widespread popularity we find recorded not only in the plays themselves, but also in such descriptions of their effect on the audience as Giraldis's in his *Discorso intorno al comporre delle commedie e delle tragedie*. Still, Vernon Lee, in a well-known essay included in *Euphorion*, could write that the Renaissance Italians "rarely or never paint horrors or death or abomination", that "the whole tragic meaning was unknown to the light and cheerful contemporaries of Ariosto", and build upon such a gratuitous assumption a theory of the amorality of the Renaissance Italians as contrasted with the maturer ethical judgment of the contemporary English! It was Giraldis Cinthio, again, who developed the type of superhuman villain he found in Seneca, with the help of elements derived from Machiavelli, as I have shown elsewhere²): chiefly the character of Acharis in *Euphemia* possesses all the requisites of the Machiavellian bugbear of the Elizabethan stage. Here we seem to be as close as we can be to the solution of at least part of a problem well formulated by T. S. Eliot: "How the influence of Seneca is related, in the Elizabethan mind, with other influences, perhaps those of Machiavelli and

¹) A careful comparison of Studley's versions of Seneca with *The Spanish Tragedy* is to be found in E. M. Spearing's Introduction to the edition of *Agamemnon* and *Medea* in *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren Englischen Dramas*, 1913 (Band 38).

²) In *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans*, Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy, read 21 March 1928. (In the press.)

Montaigne, I do not know; and I think it is a subject still to be investigated." (p. xliii of the Introduction.) And again, in the lecture: "The Seneca attitude of Pride, the Montaigne attitude of Scepticism, and the Machiavelli attitude of Cynicism, arrived at a kind of fusion in the Elizabethan individualism." One of the stages of this fusion is undoubtedly to be seen in the influence exerted on the English stage by the Italian Senecans, first of all by Giraldis, whose intentions — as Charlton says — had much in common with those of the Elizabethans, though his powers were, otherwise, of the most ordinary description. To the list of characteristics which Charlton and Kastner, quite rightly, credit Seneca, or, more exactly, the Italianated Seneca, with having bestowed on the Elizabethans (p. clxix), T. S. Eliot has been able to add a new item, forcibly illustrated: the way in which Shakespeare's heroes (and those of Chapman and Webster, too) die. The progressive development from Greek drama to the Elizabethan tragedy is well summed up thus: "In Seneca, the Greek ethics is visible underneath the Roman stoicism. In the Elizabethans, the Roman stoicism is visible beneath the Renaissance anarchism."

What Mr. Eliot has to say on the influence of Seneca on the Elizabethan diction is no less remarkable: being a poet himself, his opinion on the progress of blank verse under Senecan influence is particularly authoritative, whereas his conclusions on Elizabethan bombast, which is also traceable to Seneca, are worded in a very felicitous way:

If the Elizabethans distorted and travestied Seneca in some way, if they learned from him tricks and devices which they applied with inexpert hands, they also learned from him the essentials of declaimed verse. Their subsequent progress is a process of splitting up the primitive rhetoric, developing out of it subtle poetry and subtle tones of conversation, eventually mingling, as no other school of dramatists has done, the oratorical, the conversational, the elaborate and the simple, the direct and the indirect; so that they were able to write plays which can still be viewed as plays, with any plays, and which can still be read as poetry, with any poetry.

What are the literary merits of the translations of the *Tenne Tragedies*? Former critics were agreed in replying: very little, if any. Preference was usually given to Heywood's *Troas*, which, as a matter of fact, had been the most popular in Tudor times (it went through three editions within a few years). But even Heywood's verse, admired at the time as "smouth and fyled", was found by our modern critics not very brilliant; rather, uncouth and disfigured by glaring defects. Mr. Eliot has made a new departure. For him these translations are written in "a unique mood, which is only to be extracted and enjoyed after patient perusals. They are not translations to be read in a hurry; they do not yield their charm easily." Is this in accordance with what we have read just a page before, that "to examine such lines under the microscope is not to do them justice"? Certainly a minute analysis of the kind just described would in a way reverse the process followed by the Tudor translators; they saw Seneca's peculiarities through a magnifying lens.¹⁾ There is a *cliché* of which Studley is particularly fond: *gargle-face*. Seneca's characters become so distorted in the

¹⁾ A thorough study, by Miss E. M. Spearing, of the metre, grammar, vocabulary and style of the *Tenne Tragedies* is to be found in the *Mod. Lang. Rev.* IV (1909), pp. 437-61: it has been reprinted, with additions, in a separate volume, *The Elizabethan Translations of Seneca's Tragedies*, Cambridge, Heffer, 1912. It seems worth while to call attention here to those characteristics of the translations which have been passed over by Miss Spearing.

English translation, as to resemble no longer Roman masks, no matter how artificial, but rather to remind us of the most satanic gargle faces projecting from the walls of a Gothic building. Hieronimo's advice to the Painter, in *The Spanish Tragedy*, well describes the method which is common to the sensational literature of the age: "O let them be worse, worse: stretch thine Arte, and let their beardes be of Iudas his owne collour, and let their eie-browes iuttie over: in any case observe that."

Nothing less instinct with the Revival of Learning could be imagined than Studley's translations: his voice seems to come to us from the darkest corner of the Dark Ages. The Maenads become "bedlem wyghts" or "Bacchus bedlem priestes" (*bedlem* is a favourite word with these translators); Goblin, Hegge and Elfe rank among the Greek gods, and *manes* are seen in the shape of "griesely goblins grymme"; Love is a "wanton Elfe" or a "peevisch Elfe", Nymphs and Dryads are "wanton Fayries", "mountayne Goblins"; and in the wrong rendering of a passage in *Hercules Oetaeus* (*quota est Gorgon fera*), we hear the poet exclaiming: "How sterne a bug was snaky Gorgon grim!"¹) On the other hand, the gods are conceived as feudal lords (Dan Phoebus, Dame Thetis, Dame Juno), and are adored in churches or chapels; Jason, *decus illud ingens Graeciae*, is "the flower of Chyvalry in Greece", and Hippolytus is represented as "pursuing the Gentlemanly pastime of hunting" (*ingratum caput of Medea*, l. 465, is rendered with "O thou uncorteous gentleman"). Studley, in a quite medieval way, insinuates into the text mythological glosses, partly, no doubt, for the benefit of ignorant readers, but also, as was usual in the Middle Ages, in order to show his curious learning. So, to quote one instance only from a long list, where, in *Medea*, the Latin has: *habeo mediae dona Chimerae*, the poet takes the opportunity to describe that "bug":

His flames the monstrous staghard rough Chimera to mee gave,
In head and breast a Lyon grim, and from the Rump behynde
He sweepes the flower with lapping Tayle of Serpent feare by kynde
In Rybbes, and Loynes along his paunche yshaped lyke a Goate.

But the poet is at his best in the descriptions of hell, where he indulges in a lavish use of the much beloved epithets "filthy", "dirty", "stinking", and enlarges upon "the Stygian Puddle glum", Caron's "fusty musty Barge", and "gargle-faced Ditis dimme". His childish delight in gruesome and nasty details finds parallels only in such medieval poets as Bonvesin da Riva, bent on stirring primitive audiences with crude realistic descriptions of the sufferings of our Lord and the pains of the damned souls. With the only difference that the pretext of religious edification, always present in the medieval minstrels, has now disappeared, and the gruesome description is an aim in itself, a penny dreadfil (this tendency is generally apparent from the very titles: e. g. "the . . . most rutheful tragedy . . . entitled *Hippolytus*").

In the speech of Euribates, added by the translator to *Agamemnon*, the prison in which Electra is confined is described with plenty of blood-curdling details, among which particular attention is called to the "stinking smels" which "come belching out from filthy dirty dyke".²) Studley is so obsessed

¹) Delightful anachronisms are no less of an abiding feature of these translations than of medieval literature. A complete list of them would be a lengthy one, but at least three more instances may be recorded: *Ursae* (*Medea*, l. 759) is rendered with "Charles his stragling wayne", *ballista* with "Cannon" (*Hipp.*, l. 535), and *ferrum* (*Aga.*, l. 121) with "bylbowlblades" (from Bibao in Spain, famous for its swords).

²) Cf. with the description of the dungeon in *Tancred and Gismund*, ll. 1434 ff. With ll. 1550 ff. of the same play cf. similar descriptions in the translations of *Hippolytus* and *Thyestes*.

with squalid visions, that he is driven occasionally to mistranslate a passage, when a *prima facie* interpretation has touched him in his weak point. Thus l. 322 of *Hippolytus*: *luteo plantas cohibente socco*, becomes: "and on his feete his durty dabled Socks"! In rendering Medea's incantations the translator overreaches himself: *squamifera latebris turba desertis adest* (l. 685) occasions one of his finest pieces of high falutin':

A mowsie, rowsie, rusty route with cancred Scales Iclad
From musty, fusty, dusty dens where lurked long they had.

No matter how gruesomely realistic Seneca may be: Studley always contrives to surpass him. One needs only compare with the Latin text the description of Hippolytus's death, where the most repulsive bull-fight details are evoked by the gloating imagination of the translator:

His dragling guts then trayle about the wincing horses heeles
They thumping with thier hornes hooves agaynst his Belly kick
From bursten Paunch on heapes his blouddy bowells jumble thick.

Over the mangled body of Hippolytus, the English Phaedra offers to pluck out her eyes and to set them in the "vacant holes" of the dead youth, to break up her breast, and tear from it her own heart, in order that Hippolytus, supplied with a live organ, may come to life again. Seneca's charnel-house becomes, with Studley, a shambles hung with tortured limbs and dripping guts: the same morbid curiosity which later on urged Nashe to describe elaborate tortures in his *Unfortunate Traveller*, possessed Studley while translating Seneca, so that we can safely assume that the taste for horror was something inherent in the people and in the age. In most of the cases the result is merely grotesque, as whenever Studley tries to appeal to a child-like sense of the loathsome by insisting on the "paunch". Diomedes's horses *cruore pingues hospitum*, have "puffed paunches pampred with stoare of straungers blood"; *vastus Briareus* becomes "the hougry Briar that fifty paunches had". The ghost of Thyestes says in Latin he is *liberis plenus in me sepultis*, and in English: "And stuffed have my pampred paunche . . ." Coarseness of expression is a distinctive feature of these translations. Part of it, no doubt, is due to the unpalatable connotation certain words have received in more recent times: so the ever recurring expression "stomacke stout" rendering *animus*, *pectus*, etc. may shock a modern reader, but certainly had nothing unpleasant for the Elizabethans (we find it also, for instance, in the English translation of *Utopia*, ed. Lupton, p. 47: *hominibus animi magis excelsi* = "men of stowter stomackes"). But when we find the Latin:

referam quid alias? mene Thespiades vocant?
brevique in illas arsit Alcides face.

(*Herc. Oet.* ll. 369—70) ¹⁾

rendered thus:

What shall I speake of any more, or doth it mee behove
To pratt what pranks he played with fifty daughters in one night —

or Nessus's advice to Deianira:

si pellex tuos
invisa thalamos tulerit, et coniunx levis
aliam parenti dederit altisono nurum

(*id.*, ll. 528—30)

¹⁾ The Latin quotations are made after Gryphius's edition (Lyons 1541 and subsequent years).

translated with :

when hateful whores abuse
Thy spousall bed, or wavering man do haunt to any stewes —

or Hercules's wish to kill Deianira :

utinam liceret stipite ingesto impiam
effringere animam, quale Amazonium malum
.... domui

(*id.*, ll. 1449—51)

travestied into :

Ah, might my trunchion punch her puddinges once as whilom farde
The haughty Ladye Amazon well trounsed for her pride —

or :

experta saevam Antiope manum
(*Hipp.*, 1. 227)

becoming :

Antiope his bobbing buffets felt and heavy cuffe —

when we find that the English counterpart of : *tum primum manu bellare nuda*, is a *Schlägerei* :

the naked Fist found out
To scratch and cuffe, to box and bum, with dealing blowes about —

and the counterpart of Hippolytus's *noli-me-tangere* :

procul impudicos corpore a casto amove
tactus

(*Hipp.*, 1. 704)

runs :

Doe not with shamelesse fawning Pawes my spotless body staine —

and the idiomatic rendering of :

pudor impudentem celat, audacem quies
(*id.*, 1. 920)

sounds :

The saucie Jacke with bashful brow doth malipiertnes hide :
The rashnes of the despret Dicke by stilnesse is unspide —

and finally, when we see in the place of the stately : *redit ad auctores genus* (*id.*, 1. 907) the very homely : "Cat after kinde hee is"; then we will perhaps find Studley's quotation at the end of *Hercules Oetaeus* : *Omne genus scripti gravitate Tragoedia vincit*, the least appropriate to describe his *kermesse* and scullery style. Still, there are moments in which, quite unawares, he reaches almost the twang of Aristophanes's parody of Aeschylus : this happens whenever his love for alliteration and onomatopoeia¹⁾ leads him to use such attractive compounds as : "slibber slabber", "hugger mugger", "hoary moary (frost)", "flimflam (trick)", "myngle mangle", not to speak of the only too common "tupsie turvy", "hurly burly"; or when he roars with the voice of the wind ("Boreas boysterous blastes" : cf. Marlowe, 1 Tamb. II. iv), or of the thunder ("threatening thunders thumping thicke", "thumping thunder bouncing boltes"), or in passages like the following one, in which the Latin : *flammae medullas et cor exurunt meum* (*Ag.* 1. 132) gets swollen into :

The flashing flames and furious force of fiery fervent heate,
Outraging in my boyling brest, my burning bones doth beate :
It suckes the sappy marow out the juice it doth convay,
It frets, it teares, it rents, it gnaws, my guttes and gall away.

¹⁾ An amusing parody of bombastic alliteration is to be found in Ben Jonson's *Poetaster*, III. i, where King Daryus's "doleful strain" is burlesqued.

"Bloody blades", "grisly ghostes", "stomacke stout", "thundring thumps", "pinching payne", "pyning panges", "tupsie turvy", "hurly burly", and similar *clichés* teem also in the translations of Nuce, Nevyle and Newton. Nuce is a very indifferent translator, though his being aware of the unfitness of the fourteener for tragedy does him some credit. Also with him a simple Latin expression like: *turpi calcata coeno*, becomes: "which spurnd with *dirty* feete . . . with *filthy stinking* myre they it all beray"; and a dignified sentence like: *imminet thalamis meis*, is realistically and grotesquely rendered with: "with naked nates to presse by lovers sleight Our spousall . . . bed" (cf. also p. 170, vol. II: "That Goddesse Juno wise her brothers bed Partaking, pressed downe with buttockes red"); and *Gravitas* bids us adieu when we compare: *me dira miseri fata germani trahunt*, with: "And poore Britts [*i. e.* Britannicus's] death tugges me another way"; or: *impetu primo furit*, with:

His youthfull heate at first in filthy love,
With lusty, crusty pangs doth boyle above —

or *nocentem* (l. 247) with: "that divelish pate, that cruell cursed wight", or *ultrix Erynis* with: "that drosell dyre, that furious slut Erin", or: *calcat iacentem vulgus*, with:

If that I were a meacocke or a slouch,
Each stubborne, clubbish daw would make me couch.

Nevyle was sixteen years old when he first translated *Oedipus*; in the preface to the revised edition, in the 1581 volume, he apologises for the "grosenesse of the Style", and calls his a "base translated Tragedy". The usual creepy details are added, whenever possible, as in the description of the plague (for instance: "the sheepe . . . belching out their wasted lunges"), or in that of the inspection of the entrails at the end of the Second Act. A typical instance of the realistic taste of the translator is the rendering of l. 652, where for abstract personifications like *Letum Luesque*, etc. are substituted very concrete things: "The Pocks, the Piles, the Botch, the blaine" (a similar case is the translation of l. 1060). Also Nevyle makes use and abuse of *clichés* like: "filthy fluds", "styfling stink", "griesly ghosts", "thundering thumpes", "Boreas boysterous blastes", "the Harpies greedy paunche", and swells the text with synonyms (see, e g., the rendering of ll. 921—24). The didactic intent announced in the preface is thrust also into the mouth of the Messenger, after the translation of l. 979:

Beware betimes, by him beware, I speake unto you all:
Learne justice, truth, and feare of God by his unhappy fall.

Nevyle's puffing and foaming Oedipus continues to foam and fret and fume in Thomas Newton's translation of *Thebais*; he wants to make us thoroughly convinced that "within *his* entrailles boyles Abundant stoare of Choller fell". Also here *gravitas* is destroyed by vigorous gutter language¹⁾ of the kind used by Studley (*sacra Dirce* is "Dirce seely trull", *anus* is a "seely Trot"), and by reading in terms of Tudor London passages like the following one:

ut adulta virgo mixta captivo gregi
Thebana nurbus munus Argolicus eat?
(l. 575—6)

¹⁾ Among the original plays of the time, *Cambyes* affords perhaps the most conspicuous illustration of the taste for vernacular expressions.

which sounds in English:

Shall they as presents forced bee in dabbling dirt to toyle
Unto the munsing Mistresses, and Trulls of Argos Soyle?

The effect of l. 297:

diris, scelestis: breviter ut dicam, meis?

is entirely spoilt by the clumsy translation:

Such hatefull ympes.... such wicked Termagauntes,
As to be sonnes of such a Syre with shame may make their vauntes.
At one bare woord to tell thee all: thy brethren....

The usual *clichés* and sensational horrors are of common occurrence also in Newton's translation.

Heywood's translations, which opened the series, while they are more free from redundancies and colloquialisms than those of the others, possess real merits and here and there read like genuine poetry. I suppose that Mr. Eliot had some of Heywood's passages before his mind when he wrote about the charm of the English Seneca. The translation of *Troas* is the finest of all. Here also the Latin tragedian was at his best. Were it only for the scene between Andromache and Ulysses, he would amply deserve the repute of subtle analyser of the human passions with which he is credited. In the translation of l. 766 ff., Latin *gravitas*, at last, makes room for something better than mere *Derbheit*, and Andromache's lines to her child have in the English text a quality of poignant tenderness which we miss in the original. A fine passage which occurs in *Hercules Furens*, apropos of the sound of Orpheus's lyre in hell: "and clearer doth resound in darker place", for the Latin l. 576: *et surdis resonat clarius in locis*, has provoked from the editor of Heywood's translations in *Materialien* a rather obtuse remark: "*Dark* seems to have here the sense of gloomy, silent."

Charles Whibley, who is the editor of the Second Series of Constable's *Tudor Translations*, has aimed, apparently, at reproducing literally the 1581 text of the *Tenne Tragedies*, which is notoriously very corrupt. Besides, this text had already been reproduced in 1887, by the Spenser Society (*Publications*, nos. 43-44). On the other hand, the earlier editions of most of the translations supply better texts, and on these latter E. M. Spearing and H. de Vocht based their editions for the *Materialien* (vols. 38 and 41). I am at a loss to see what useful purpose is served by Mr. Whibley's policy. Does he want us to have before our eyes the 1581 text, with all its misprints, exactly as it appeared to contemporary readers? But, then, this end had been already reached, in a much better way, by the black letter reprint of the Spenser Society. Does he want to supply modern readers with a readable text (which, after all, seems a much more sensible policy)? Then I do not see why the idolatrous fidelity to the 1581 text ought to go to the length of reproducing gross misprints, which were not in the intention either of the author or of the original publisher. At any rate, even if such policy seemed advisable, a list of corrupt passages ought to have been supplied at the end. In no case can I see how a conscientious editor could have ignored the existence of the critical editions provided by the *Materialien*, unless duties of editorship are considered as fulfilled with taking down the

shelf a copy of the 1581 Seneca and handing it over to the printer and the proof-corrector.¹⁾

Liverpool.

MARIO PRAZ.

¹⁾ A list of all the misprints in this reprint of the 1581 text would cover several pages: here is, however, a note of some of the most glaring blunders I have come across in my perusal. I give up correcting punctuation which, as De Vocht has already remarked, "is little less than bewildering". I mark with an asterisk all the cases in which the Spenser Society reprint is correct:

Vol. I. (*Hercules Furens*) p. 14, l. 17: **do thronne*, read *doth ronne*; p. 20, l. 9 from foot: **waur*, read *waue*; p. 21, l. 3: **brether as*, read *brethern*s; p. 22, l. 11 from foot: *braggig*, read *bragging*; p. 26, l. 8: *thon*, read *thou*; p. 28 l. 6: *out set*, read *out fet* (*Materialien: out fette*); p. 29, l. 6 from foot: **then my*, read *th'enmy*; p. 36, l. 14: **heare*, read *heares*; p. 45, l. 2: *brestee*, read *brestes*; p. 46, l. 9 from foot: *then from my*, read *them from me*; p. 47, l. 7: **victorly*, read *victor ly*.

(*Thyestes*) p. 59, last line: *burned*, read *burdned*; p. 61, l. 10: *woundes*, read *woodes*; p. 64, l. 4 from foot: **sayle*, read *sayle*; p. 80, l. 1: **gengey*, read *ganget*; *ib.*, l. 13: **count nesice*, read *count' nauce*; p. 83, l. 6 from foot: **Skife*, read *Skise* (=Skies); p. 84, l. 3: **the* read *she*; p. 88, l. 22: *gene*, read *geue*; p. 93, l. 4 from foot: *Putoes*, read *Plutoes*.

(*Thebais*) p. 101, l. 1: **bedlemitke*, read *bedlemlike*; *ib.*, l. 8 from foot: **slyepe*, read *styepe*; p. 105, l. 6: *murtdrou*s, Spenser Soc. has *muridrou*s; *ib.*, l. 8 from foot: *egallt*, Spenser Soc. has *egall*; p. 113, l. 6 from foot: *And* obviously stands for *Than*, but the preceding and following lines, both beginning with *And*, caused the confusion; p. 132, l. 14 from foot: **Seftos*, read *Sestos*: p. 134 is misnumbered 133.

(*Hippolytus*) p. 138, l. 1: **Hymerus*, read *Hymetus*; p. 139, l. 2: **shaghatry*, read *shaghairy*; p. 145, l. 3 from foot: **topste*, read *topsie*; p. 152, l. 2: *at*, read *art*; p. 153, l. 14: *plooming*, read *blooming*; p. 155, l. 16: **An*, read *And*; p. 160, l. 3 from foot: *shape*, read *shade*; p. 164, l. 6: *undermint*, read *undermine*; *ib.*, l. 22: **Whyse*, read *Whyle*; p. 165, l. 12: *unplagude*, read *unplagued*.

(*Oedipus*) The text of this tragedy in the 1581 edition is correct enough, owing to the fact that it was an independent text, revised probably by Nevyle himself.

Vol. II. (*Troas*) p. 11: *WOMAN*, read *WOMEN*; *ib.*, l. 10 from foot: *rages*, read *roges*; p. 24, l. 15: **Seyros*, read *Scyros*; p. 34, l. 12 from foot: *thy*, read *the*; p. 36, l. 16 from foot: **both*, read *doth*; *ib.*, l. 13 from foot: **reeviste*, read *reedifie*; p. 40, l. 16: **thy*, read *they*; p. 47, l. 2: *awretch*, read *a wretch*; p. 50, l. 21: *Calchas*, read *Colchus*; p. 51, l. 14: **Pindaris*, read *Tindaris*.

(*Medea*) p. 69, l. 11 from foot: *olde bootes*: here at least, the old printer, failing to use the capital letter for *Bootes*, has caused a funny ambiguity.

(*Agamemnon*) p. 106, l. 6: **fath*, read *fatth*; p. 109, l. 9 from foot: *Eflamd*, read *Enflamd*; p. 114, l. 3 from foot: *thon*, read *thou*; p. 115, l. 3: **Osla*, read *Ossa*; p. 127, l. 9: *heads*, read *head*.

(*Octavia*) p. 145, l. 5 from foot: **waundes*, read *woundes*; p. 147, l. 4: **listy*, read *lusty*; p. 154, l. 4: *tombs*, read *tombe*; p. 157, l. 14: **drofell*, read *drosell*; p. 188, l. 17 from foot: *pates*, read *fates*.

(*Hercules Oetaeus*) p. 194, l. 10 from foot: **Grecis*, read *Grecia*; p. 196, l. 2 from foot: **Cenci*, read *Cenei*; p. 213, l. 10: *Hecles*, read *Hercles*; p. 232, l. 7: *Juarmen*, read *Inarmen* (Lat.: *Inarimen*); p. 233, l. 7 (and p. 239, l. 19, and p. 244, l. 5 from foot): *Apeltree*, read *Axeltree*; p. 234, l. 6 from foot: **bary*, read *hary*; p. 235, l. 9: *Ampitrio*, read *Amphitrio*; p. 239, l. 11: *agroning*, read *a groning*; p. 250, l. 3: *Euceladus*, read *Enceladus*; p. 255, l. 12: **fyrripes*, read *fyrryes*; *ib.*, l. 6 from foot: *Cocitas*, read *Cocitus*.

From this list it appears that the Spenser Society reprint provided a much better text than the present, with perhaps one single exception: in the *Hippolytus*, the Constable reprint (Vol. I, p. 181, l. 9 from foot) has correctly: *iii kingdomes*, whereas the Spenser Society edition has: *in kingdomes*.

Studien zur Geschichte und Charakteristik des Refrains in der englischen Literatur. Von FRIEDRICH G. RUHRMANN. (Angl. Forschungen. Herausg. von Dr. J. Hoops, Heft 64). — Heidelberg 1927. — 10,50 Mk.

'The origin of the refrain is doubtless to be found in the days when poetry was improvised, and the singer required a rest in which to collect his thoughts for the next stage. But in any case its present metrical value lies firstly in the element of repetition, and secondly in its function of holding the structure together and clinching it firmly and decisively, so concentrating the poetic energy and intensifying the metrical effect; while, thirdly, it may serve the purpose of emphasizing some important emotional aspect of the poem.' Thus Egerton Smith in *The Principles of English Metre* (p. 194).

Thus, essentially, Ruhrmann in his introductory chapter. But he follows this up with an investigation, partly historical, partly æsthetic, which would constitute a strong claim to our gratitude, if the price of the book (179 pages in all) were a little lower.

The comparatively early appearance of the literary or artistic refrain in Anglo-Saxon poetry points to the influence of the Church, which for its liturgy made an extensive use of refrainlike repetitions. As likely as not this fact also helped to acclimatize refrains taken from a foreign language, Latin or French, and perhaps meaningless refrains as well, which on the other hand have affinities with the choruses of chanties and 'songs of labour.' The question whether the refrain was surging contemporaneously with the stanza proper is left open by the author, on the plea that literature is not concerned with it, and if the problem is worth attacking, it should be attacked by musicians. The author might instead have tackled another problem: the line of demarcation between 'Volksdichtung' and 'Kunstpoesie'. The latter genre is by no means identical with 'artificial poetry', as a superficial perusal of Ruhrmann's book might easily suggest (cf. p. 43), and popular though *Edward, Edward!* — that blood-curdling ballad — doubtless was, the man who composed it was a conscious artist, not a human lark singing unpremeditated lays. Such mediæval inventions as triplets, villanelles *et hoc genus omne*, were, of course, artificial and often annoyingly so, but *Edward*, too, was composed to a rigid metrical scheme, and nobody will dream of applying to it epithets like 'akademisch', 'gelehrtenhaft', 'gemacht' or 'gewollt'. Perhaps the term 'Volksdichtung' should be used only to denote such popular poems, ballads, songs, as show signs of deterioration in consequence of being repeated from memory and being handed down from one 'singer' to another.

Among the poets that have handled the refrain with elegance and originality there are several on whom the author bestows some special praise. Such are Wyatt, Sidney (who wrote 'Persian' quatrains before FitzGerald), Shakespeare, Burns, (who, being a Lowlander with a Saxon name, should not have been referred to as a Gael!), Tennyson, Poe, Rossetti. The author, who complains of the literary refrain being under a cloud nowadays (176), appears to be ignorant of Gibson's use of it, e.g. in *Annabel Rose and Jeremiah Fairley*:

Why did you call me, Jeremiah Fairley —
 Why did you call me as I went by?
 Never had the blackbird sung more rarely,
 Never had the sun shone brighter in the sky
 Than when I heard you calling, crying on my name,
 And into my young heart the strange trouble came.

*Why did you answer me, Annabel Rose?
 Goodness gracious only knows!
 Annabel Rose, you're speaking true,
 And that is just my answer too.*

*Why did you marry me, Jeremiah Fairley?
 Why did you carry me home to your farm?
 Bleak blows the wind and the sun shines rarely,
 And little care you now if I should come to harm.
 Why did you marry me and give me your name
 To bring me to trouble and sorrow and shame?
 Why did you come with me, Annabel Rose?
 Goodness gracious only knows!
 Annabel Rose, you're speaking true,
 And that is just my answer too*

(‘I heard a Sailor’, p. 35).

Certain statements which are as impossible of proof as of refutation might have been left out. Is the use of *Deor's* refrain in his final stanza as mechanical as Ruhrmann (following Imelmann) makes it out to be? And if the melancholy tenderness of feeling that informs *The Seafarer* (p. 12) is ‘ungermanic’, what about ‘Es ist bestimmt in Gottes Rat’ and ‘Morgen muss ich fort von hier’? And Pan’s appearance in Elizabeth Browning’s well-known poem, ‘splashing and paddling with hoofs of a goat’, is grotesque, no doubt, — but where is the ‘Heiterkeit’? (p. 126).

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

Current Letters and Philology.

6. Criticism and Biography.

Occasionally the student of a literary period should leave the sphere of literature proper to make a few excursions into different domains. If he does not, he will at last be inclined to forget that in the age on which his attention is focussed, the country was not exclusively inhabited by writers and by the heroes and minor figures of fiction, that there also lived painters, musicians, divines, philosophers, politicians, generals and a host of more ordinary mortals. And he cannot afford to ignore their existence, their multifarious activities, as a mathematician may profitably do. The study of the allied arts, of painting in particular, will foster a more judicious appreciation of literary works; the history of religion, philosophy, politics, the social and economic conditions will often prove of great value for the interpretation of the literature of a past period, for a clear insight into its aims and ideals. Time and human energy, however, are sadly limited and no one save the legendary superman can hope to attain to real knowledge of all the various subjects mentioned. But then it is by no means necessary to reach this ideal; in this case even a little learning, far from being dangerous, may stand the student of literature in good stead. And fortunately there are books enough from which the general information sufficient for his purpose, may be conveniently acquired. For the eighteenth century we know of none better than Mr. Turberville’s excellent compendium: *English Men and Manners in the 18th Century*. (Oxf. Univ. Press, 10 sh.). Both the author and the publishers deserve the gratitude of all students of this remarkable period of English literature. It gives astonishing value for its moderate price; it is prepossessing in outward appearance, it is very well printed on good paper and it contains upwards of two hundred flawlessly reproduced illustrations: portraits, pictures, documents, curious prints, caricatures, playbills, maps, etc. These illustrations do indeed, as the author says in his preface, form an integral part of the book as important as the letter-press. He has been very felicitous in his choice and the plates often reveal certain aspects of the age better than many words could do. But the text is hardly less interesting. The author seems especially conversant with politics, but his knowledge of other subjects is extensive enough to enable him to choose the significant details which make his short surveys at once instructive and picturesque.

The first short chapter “Introductory” is an impartial estimate of the achievements of the period; it indicates contrasting tendencies and incidentally calls attention to

some features that are often lost sight of. It is followed by an "Outline of Events", a summary by way of preface, necessary because the scheme of the book "involved the substitution of treatment by subject for a purely chronological narrative." "The Social Scene" gives a comprehensive picture of various spheres of life: The Court, the World of Fashion, the Blue-stockings, the Watering-places etc.; particularly the sections on The Farmers and The Manufacturers are interesting, and contain many curious little-known data. Five chapters are devoted to the political life of the period, a difficult subject treated with admirable clarity, two to the Divines and the Philanthropists and after a short glance at Grub Street, the author turns his attention to the Artists, giving short biographies of the famous painters: Hogarth, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Gainsborough, Romney, discussing the character of their work and relating many interesting facts about the makers of the tasteful furniture, the elegant ceramic ware of the period. In the other chapters: "Drama, Stage and Music", "Empire Builders", "The Soldiers", "The Admirals" the same high standard is maintained and the full Index and the carefully selected bibliographies enhance the value of this manual, which may form a solid basis for further study.

Another book that tells us about the men and manners of this period, though in an altogether different way, is Grace Murray's *Personalities of the 18th Century* (London, Heath Cranton, 1927, 12/6). It is almost the reverse of what is usually called a scholarly production. The authoress seems to be particularly attracted towards the oddities of life, comic and singular characters, unusual incidents, the quips and cranks of fate and her book itself has some odd features. It is introduced by a strange, flimsy, inadequate foreword; to the six very good portraits it contains the publisher has gratuitously added as illustrations several reproductions of playbills, dating, not as might have been expected from the 18th, but from the 19th century, some as late as 1845; in the text dates are almost entirely absent, which makes it difficult to place the personages, to follow the sequence of events; the division into chapters is perfectly arbitrary and superfluous: the whole book consists of a collection of anecdotes haphazardly strung together. But the incidents are told in a lively way, the characters are often deftly sketched and the narrative, rambling though it be, is eminently readable, and instructive for the sidelights it throws on the morals and manners of the age as well as for the biographies of several interesting personages. Among the scores of celebrities, mostly of the second and third magnitude, that pass us in rapid succession are Beckford, Blair, Boswell, George Colman, Fuseli, Garrick, Mrs. Godwin, Horne Tooke, Dr. Johnson, Monk Lewis, John Opie, Sheridan, Samuel Smiles, Dr. Wolcot, Christopher Smart, Walpole, etc.

The year 1927, the Blake centenary, saw the publication of several attractive new editions of his poetry, together with a great many articles, essays and studies on the work and personality of this extremely remarkable artist, who wrote some of the most lovely and melodious lyrics of the century, who often astonishes by flashes of deep wisdom and original thought, far ahead of his times, but who also occasionally dropped into childish utterances and left some longer works notorious for their obscurity. Mr. Plover has once more tried to penetrate into these dark regions in his *Introduction to the Study of Blake* (Dent 4s. 6d.). It is a well-written, interesting and enthusiastic essay, but it seems a pity that he has not devoted more attention to what makes Blake dear to ordinary readers: his high artistic and poetical achievement. The Introduction by Jack Lindsay to the beautiful edition of the *Poetical Sketches*, issued by the Scholartis Press, does this in an admirable manner. His discussion of the metrical characteristics of the lyrics is very instructive, showing Blake's kinship with the Elisabethans and cleverly analysing the methods which helped him to ensure his wonderful musical effects. A few other editions illustrated with Blake's strangely beautiful engravings have recently appeared, but they are prohibitive in price and were only to be had by previous subscription. The best cheap edition I know is the *Selected Poems* in the World's Classics (2sh.), which contains all that appeals to the general reader and even more: The Songs of Innocence and of Experience, poems from the Poetical Sketches, from the Rossetti and the Pickering MSS., The Book of Thel, the quaint but highly interesting Marriage of Heaven and Hell, poems from The Four Zoas, Milton, Jerusalem etc., besides a few prose pieces and letters. Basil de Selincourt has contributed a short, but capable and suggestive introduction to the handsome, well-printed volume.

Talking of cheap editions, we are reminded of two other valuable little books that have come in our way. The first is the re-issue of Lord Houghton's *Life of Keats* (Everyman's Library, 2 sh.) which contains the poet's correspondence with his brothers and friends. These wise, noble, elevating letters were by no means easily accessible and this recent addition to the well-stocked library therefore supplies a real want. It is a pity that the bibliography given is quite out of date and incomplete, but this is the only fault we have to find with the carefully edited volume. The other very cheap

publication to which we want to draw our readers' attention is J. B. Priestley's survey of *The English Novel* (Benn's Sixpenny Library, Nr. 87). In about eighty closely, but very clearly printed pages this neat little book gives a vivid account of English fiction from the 18th century down to our own times. It has been the author's aim to discuss the novels from the point of view of a modern reader, the novelists being "estimated according to their value to us, here and now." Naturally he could only give a rapid review of the extensive subject, but he has made the most of the space allotted to him, and as a complement to the ordinary handbooks this lively essay will render admirable service.¹⁾

A very stimulating collection of critical essays, which was first published in 1920, but deserves greater attention than it has hitherto received, is *The Sacred Wood*²⁾ (2nd ed., Methuen, 6 sh.) by T. S. Eliot, the well-known poet and critic. The first part contains a very interesting investigation into the aims and functions of criticism, incidentally showing in how far critics as Coleridge, Matthew Arnold, Swinburne, Symonds and others have fallen short of the ideal. The second part deals chiefly with Elizabethan dramatists, Shakespeare, Marlowe, Massinger etc. Particularly good is the essay on Ben Jonson, which succeeds in awakening fresh interest in his work and personality, and even about Hamlet Mr. Eliot makes some new, very suggestive remarks. His discussion of "Rhetoric" is equally original and instructive. Other essays well worth reading are those on Swinburne as a poet, Dante and Blake.

Little essays and critical articles in a lighter vein, originally written by J. Middleton Murry for the Times and a few other papers, we find in the volume *Pencilings* (Collins, 1923) which has now been reprinted as one of the "Kings' Way Classics" (Collins, 1928, 3/6). In this book the distinguished critic broaches a great variety of subjects, rambling pleasantly along the by-ways of literature and life, but also often tackling the fundamental problems of criticism such as the significance of style, the relation between art and morality, literature and science, or discussing writers as Dickens, Disraeli, Congreve, Molière, Stephen Phillips and others. Though he is here in a conversational mood, he is never commonplace or superficial. On the contrary, time and again we are surprised by penetrating remarks, by the original treatment of even the most hackneyed subjects, by felicitous turns and phrases that stick in the memory. It is an entertaining and at the same time an instructive book, sometimes witty and very amusing—as in the shrewd ironic analysis of an unguarded utterance of Mr. Winston Churchill—and each of these delicate sketches bears the impress of a rich, original and very sensitive personality. It is gratifying to note that his efforts to establish a new periodical to take the place of the "Adelphi" have met with evident success. The quarterly he is now editing (*The New Adelphi*) seems to have been erected on a firmer financial basis and the three numbers that have thus far appeared are in every way equal, if not superior to those of the former monthly at its best.

A curious, original and interesting volume has been compiled by Edgell Rickword (*Scrutinies*; London, Wishart & Co, 1928, 7/6). Besides a short article on 'Contemporary Poetry' and a negligible extravaganza 'Ancients and Moderns', it contains ten grim, ruthless attacks by ten different critics on older writers of repute: Barrie, Arnold Bennett, Chesterton, de la Mare, Galsworthy, Kipling, Masfield, George Moore, Shaw and Wells. The result of this thoroughgoing 'revaluation' is, that the authors in question are all found wanting, nay that their work appears devoid of almost any real merit and breathes a spirit hateful to the younger generation. Some of the articles are emphatic, noisy statements of dislike rather than discerning critical essays; others are much better and contain many shrewd remarks and some judgments with which we can cordially agree. It is indeed undeniable that several of the authors in question have sometimes been greatly overestimated, yet the treatment they receive here is in most cases equally unjust and one-sided. For one thing the articles are too short for the subjects they deal with; they are incomplete, often leaving important aspects of the work out of consideration; besides it is on the whole not so much the æsthetic quality of the books that is challenged as their philosophic background, the convictions, the outlook on life of the authors. Some of these fierce critics remind us indeed of the old-time iconoclasts who indiscriminately destroyed all images for what they represented, as symbols of a hostile religion, irrespective of their historic importance, their beauty or interest as works of art. And yet *Scrutinies* is a volume that deserves study, and a more detailed discussion than we can devote to it in these pages. It is but natural that a younger generation should become impatient of tradition and disagree with their predecessors; and it is a truism of literary history, that such a rebellious reaction in the beginning

¹⁾ Another admirable little volume in the same series is *English Literature* by Prof. C. H. Herford. — Ed.

²⁾ The first edition was reviewed in E. S., Febr. 1922, IV, 42-43. — Ed.

always goes too far. When we do not forget this and make allowances for the violence of its tone and its exaggerations, the reading of this book will prove useful and instructive. It incites to honest thought, to a careful reconsideration of our fixed opinions and cherished judgements; besides it reveals the aims and ideals of a group of younger writers and can thus aid us to trace certain tendencies in modern literature.

Admirers of Katherine Mansfield's exquisitely pure and unique art will be grateful for the publication of her *Journal* (Constable 1927, 6/-), parts of which appeared in the *Adelphi* some years ago. Her attempts at keeping a regular diary were repeatedly frustrated, some portions of it were evidently jotted down at odd moments during the incessant peregrinations she made in her pathetic search for health; there are especially in the beginning many trifling details or entries which could only be fully understood if we knew more of the circumstances under which they were written; and references that remain more or less obscure — yet somehow even these rambling, incomplete parts often make a deep impression and we consider the *Journal* one of the most beautiful books that have recently appeared, a human document of lasting value. Besides much searching self-analysis, opinions about books and artists, penetrating observations on life and nature in England and abroad, the book contains a great many small but graphic pen-pictures, important notes about some of her best-known stories and plans for others that were never to be written. Towards the end of her life she became conscious of an inner change, a re-birth; she had conquered her sufferings and the pages in which she writes about her struggle and ultimate victory are highly interesting and suffused with a serene beauty. It is but rarely that we are granted such an intimate vision of the workings of a really rich and noble mind and the *Journal* makes us once more realize that by her early death English literature suffered a grievous loss.

A. G. v. K.

Brief Mention.

Het Emphatisch Gebruik van Relatief-Pronominale Uitgangen in het Blackfoot. Door Prof. Dr. C. G. UHLENBECK. Uit: Festschrift für P. W. Schmidt.

Some readers will wonder at the subject of this note: we are not offering a review. But by way of illustration to the observation in our *Guide to English Studies* (*English Studies* VII, 39) where we argued that study of unrelated languages may be as instructive as historical language-study, we will only quote the introductory paragraph of this essay: „Zoo oud als de menschelijke taal is de tegenstelling van hoofdzin en bijzin. Althans zoolang de menschen elkander naast éénledige ook méérledige mededeelingen hebben gedaan, zijn die méérledige mededeelingen, indien zij niet bloote opsommingen waren, stellig naarmate van hetgeen in het bewustzijn van den spreker op den voorgrond stond, en hetgeen door hetzij haast om tot het belangrijkste te komen, hetzij door andere emotioneele factoren op den achtergrond van dat bewustzijn teruggedrongen werd, door tempo, door intonatie, door expiratorisch accent, door rekking of verkorting en vervluchtiging genuanceerd geweest, ook voordat het onderscheid van hoofdzin en bijzin morphologisch of syntactisch, of beide tegelijk, door den taalvorm werd weerspiegeld. Maar ook bij bloote opsommingen zal in den regel nuanceering het gewone zijn geweest, ja misschien is geen enkele méérledige mededeeling wérkelijk een bloote opsomming.”

After this the treatment of the compound and the double sentence in the handbooks will seem almost comical in its apparently systematic and final treatment of this difficult problem. — E. K.

Bibliography.

PERIODICALS.

Neophilologus. XIII, 2. Jan. 1928. J. H. Kern, Shakespeare's Epitaphs and Francis Bacon (107—117). — J. A. Falconer, Shakespeare's lost chance (117—123). — *Id.* XIII, 3. April 1928. A. G. van Kranendonk, Opmerkingen over beschrijvingskunst in den Engelschen roman (199—213). — *Id.* Tienjarig Register *Neophilologus*, Jaargang I—X. Bewerkt door Dr. Th. M. Chatzen.

De Drie Talen. 44, 1. Jan. 1928. L. P. H. Eykman, De plaats van het voorzetsel (1—4). — *Id.* 44, 2. Febr. 1928; & 44, 4. April 1928. L. P. H. Eykman, Rather-Pretty (17—21, 49—53).

The Review of English Studies. IV, 13. Jan. 1928. A. H. Nethercot, Abraham Cowley as Dramatist. — A. Koszul, Was Bishop William Barlow Friar Jerome Barlow? — B. M. Ward, Further research on *A Hundreth Sundrie Flowres*. — W. S. Clark, The sources of the Restoration heroic play. — A. K. McIlwraith, *The Virgins Character*. — I. Gourvitch, The Welsh element in the *Polyolbion*. — **Id.** IV, 14. April 1928. A. M. C. Latham, Sir Walter Raleigh's *Cynthia*. — L. B. Wright, Notes on Thomas Heywood's later reputation. — K. L. Wood-Legh, The Franklin. — W. W. Grey, Act-divisions in Shakespeare. — E. S. de Beer, The later life of Samuel Butler. — R. W. King, Crabb Robinson's opinion of Shelley. — D. M. Meads, Searching local records.

The Modern Language Review. XXIII, 1. Jan. 1928. M. Day, The revisions of 'Piers Plowman'. — Allardyce Nicoll reviews Sir Samuel Tuke, *The Adventures of Five Hours*, ed. by A. E. H. Swaen. — D. D. notices M. S. Serjeantson, *The Distribution of Dialect Characters in Middle English*, a reprint of the article published in *English Studies*, IV, 1922. — C. J. Sisson succeeds Prof. G. C. Moore Smith as editor of the English section. — **Id.** XXIII, 2. April 1928. W. E. Collinson, The 'Soul of Grammar' and the 'Philosophy of Grammar' with special reference to the question of English cases. (Really a review of Sonnenschein, *The Soul of Grammar*, and of Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar*, vol. III. As Mr. Collinson remarks, 'the foreign teacher of English... is often surprised to find an issue being fought out here, which he had long regarded as settled'.) — E. E. Stoll, Cleopatra. — M. F. Liddell, Ferdinand Freiligrath's debt to English Poets.

American Speech enters upon its third year as a bimonthly instead of a monthly periodical. III, 1. (Oct. 1927) contains a considerable number of small notes of lexicographical interest, as usual. Among them we note a list of British-English words with their American equivalents as given in a recent American book called "Let's go to the Movies", by Iris Barry; it is not necessary to enlarge on the significance of this cleavage between the two standards of educated English. — There are two longer articles, one on the *Grammar of the Ozark dialect* (Northwest Arkansas) by Vance Randolph, and another on the *Placenames of Appanoose County, Iowa*, by T. J. Fitzpatrick. — **Id.** III, 2 contains an important article by T. Hilding Svartengren on the *Feminine Gender* (of non-personal nouns) in *Anglo-American*. There is a longer note on *Nifty, Hefty, Natty, Snappy* by Mrs. Klara H. Collitz, and a full bibliography. — **Id.** III, 3 (Febr. 1928), and III, 4 (April 1928). Both numbers contain many interesting short articles. The first number gives information on a new experiment to be made by the American Linguistic Society: a sort of university summer meeting to be held at Yale University for six weeks (July 9 to August 17). A great many well-known linguists will give lectures. — Among the articles we draw special attention to Miss Mildred Lambert's *Studies in Stylistics*; a short note on Kansas University Slang, by Carl Pingry and Vance Randolph, which gives unintended but valuable sidelights on American university life; on English or Latin Plurals for Anglicized Latin nouns, by Carleton R. Ball; and a note by Kemp Malone on the formation and the reception in the English press of The International Council for English, formed with a view of attempting to prevent British and American English from drifting so far apart as to become two distinct and mutually hardly intelligible languages. — There are many reviews, including a long and appreciative one on the grammars of Poutsma, Jespersen, and Kruisinga, by A. G. Kennedy.

Language. III, 4. Dec. 1927. Includes S. Moore, Loss of Final *n* in Inflectional Syllables in Middle English. — **Id.** IV, 1. March 1928. Includes a note by Holmes on the etymology of French *carole*. — Book Reviews. — Notes. — Books Received.

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America. XLII, 4. Dec. 1927. O. F. Emerson, More notes on *Pearl*. — F. B. Magoun Jr., The source of Chaucer's *Rime of Sir Thopas*. — M. A. Hill, Rhetorical balance in Chaucer's poetry. — W. P. Cumming, A Middle English MS in the Bibliothèque Ste. Geneviève, Paris. — S. F. Damon, Milton and Marston. — W. Haller, Before *Areopagitica*. — P. F. Jones, Milton and the epic subject from British history. — W. Brewer, Two Athurian models for *Samson Agonistes*. — A. O. Lovejoy, Optimism and Romanticism. — R. E. Spiller, A new biographical source for William Cowper. — E. V. Weller, Keats and Mary Tighe. — G. W. Landrum, More concerning Chapman's Homer and Keats. — C. D. Thorpe, Wordsworth and Keats — a study in personal and critical impression. — J. C. Blankenagel, Carlyle as a critic of Grillparzer. — **Id.** Supplement and List of Members, 1927. — **Id.** XLIII, 1. March 1928. American Bibliography for 1927. — F. E. Fawcett, Legends of Joseph in Old and Middle English. — O. Cargill and M. Schlauch, *The Pearl* and its jeweler. — F. A. Foster, Was Gilbert Pilkington author of the *Secunda Pastorum*? — L. Wann, A new examination of the manuscript of the

Towneley Plays. — E. G. Clark, The York plays and the *Gospel of Nichodemus*. — C. Lloyd, Edmund Waller as a member of the Royal Society. — J. R. Moore, Contemporary satire in Otway's *Venice Preserved*. — P. S. Wood, The opposition to neo-classicism in England between 1660 and 1700. — L. Stevenson, Brooke's *Universal Beauty* and modern thought. — M. Gabriel and Mueschke, Two contemporary sources of Sheridan's *The Rivals*. — A. B. Hopkins, Ritson's *Life of King Arthur*. — W. B. Cairns, British republication of American writings. — E. W. Scripture, The choriambus in English verse.

Studies in Philology. XXV, 1. Jan. 1928. H. N. Fairchild, Unpublished references to Blake by Hayley and Lady Hesketh. — F. G. Pierce, Blake and Klopstock. — E. Partridge, The 1762 efflorescence of Poetics. — R. D. Havens, Thomas Warton and the eighteenth century dilemma. — J. F. Royster, The "Chaucer Concordance". — **Id.** XXV, 2. April 1928. Elizabethan Studies: Thirteenth Series. E. M. Albright, Spenser's reason for rejecting the Cantos of Mutability. — V. B. Hulbert, A new interpretation of Spenser's "Muiopotmos". — S. M. Salyer, Hall's Satires and the Harvey-Nashe controversy. — J. R. Moore, Thomas Heywood's "Pack Clouds Away" and "The Rape of Lucrece". — H. Craig, Recent literature of the English Renaissance.

Philological Quarterly. VI, 4. Oct. 1927. S. M. Salyer, Renaissance influences in Hall's *Mundus alter et idem*. — M. Y. Hughes, Dryden as a satirist. — C. H. Grabo, Astronomical allusions in Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*. — T. W. Baldwin and M. Channing Linthicum, The date of *Ralph Roister Doister*. — VII, 1. Jan. 1928. J. F. Royster, The first edition of De la Mothe's *French Alphabet* and of Hollyband's *French Schoolemaister*. — R. C. Whitford, Juvenal in England, 1750—1802. — E. L. Freeman, Jeremy Collier and Francis Bacon. — K. H. Gatch, Shakespeare's allusions to the older drama. — F. E. Pierce, Wordsworth and Thomas Taylor. — R. W. Lee, Castiglione's influence on Spenser's early Hymns.

Modern Language Notes. XLII, 8. Dec. 1927. T. M. Raysor, The study of Shakespeare's characters in the eighteenth century. — A. L. Smith, The primitivism of Joseph Warton. — G. W. Whiting, The date of Hazlitt's first visit to Coleridge. — F. W. Hilles, "Mother of Dead Dogs". — T. W. Baldwin, Sir John Denham and 'Paradise Lost'. — **Id.** Elisabethan players as tradesfolk. — L. B. Wright, The male-friendship cult in Thomas Heywood's plays. — E. Greenlaw, Una and her lamb. — K. Campbell, Marginalia on Longfellow, Lowell, and Poe. — **Id.** XLIII, 1. Jan. 1928. V. B. Heltzel, 'The Rules of Civility' (1671) and its French source. — B. Maxwell, The date of 'The Noble Gentleman'. — R. Withington, A note on 'Eastward Ho', I, ii, 178. — R. C. Whitford, Gleanings of Churchill bibliography. — M. R. Small, The source of a note in Johnson's edition of 'Macbeth'. — A. D. McKillop, The first English translator of 'Werther'. — J. D. Jordan, 'The Eve of St. Agnes' and 'The Lay of the Last Minstrel'. — J. M. Anderson, A note on the date of 'Winnere and Wastoure'. — **Id.** XLIII, 2. Febr. 1928. J. W. Bowyer, Susanna Freeman Centlivre. — W. H. Irving, An Imitation of the 'Faerie Queene'. — E. B. Reed, 'Wynter Wakeneth Al My Care'. — E. Wray, English adaptations of French drama between 1780 and 1815. — R. E. Bennett, A note on the Cyrano-Swift criticism. — J. T. Hillhouse, 'A' or 'An'. — D. Bush, Musaeus in English verse. — S. Robertson, Chaucer and Wordsworth. — O. J. Todd, Who wrote Shakespeare's Plays? — L. L. Greene, A re-arrangement of 'Christ and Satan'. — H. Buck, A 'Roderick Random' play, 1748. — E. H. C. Oliphant, A note. — H. M. Dargan, reviews. H. Teerink, The History of John Bull. — **Id.** XLIII, 3. March 1928. W. L. Schwartz, A Study of Amy Lowell's Far Eastern verse. — E. D. Snyder, Poe and Amy Lowell. — J. T. Hillhouse, The man of taste. — E. S. Knappe, A note on Chaucer's yeoman. — H. L. Savage, A note on 'Parlement of the Thre Ages' 38. — T. M. Raysor, Coleridge marginalia. — R. Turner reviews J. F. Bense, Anglo-Dutch Relations. — **Id.** XLIII, 4. April 1928. H. B. Lathrop, Janus Cornarius's 'Selecta Epigrammata Graeca' and the early English epigrammatists. — C. O. Chapman, 'The Parson's Tale': a mediaeval sermon. — S. Robertson, Old English verse in Chaucer. — P. E. Dustoor, Notes on the E. E. T. S. edition of the Newcastle 'Noah's Ark'. — L. B. Wright, A note on dramatic piracy. — **Id.** XLIII, 5. May 1928. L. B. Wright, Heywood and the popularizing of history. — G. Williamson, Sir Thomas More's view of drama. — R. R. Cawley, George Gascoigne and the Siege of Famagusta. — M. D. Clubb, The second book of the 'Cædmonian' manuscript. — R. P. Bond, A triple burlesque. — H. Stearns, The date of the 'Garlande of Laurell'. — P. Barrett, Shakespeare's paraphrase of his 'Thought-executing fires'. — T. E. Terrill, A note on John Donne's early reading. — H. S. Hughes, Another letter by Horace Walpole. — A. E. Case, The model for Pope's verses 'To the Author of a Poem Intituled 'Successio''. — L. W. Miles reviews Postma, Tennyson as seen by his parodists.

The Yale Review. Jan. 1928. Frank Swinnerton, Disraeli as novelist. — **Id.** April 1928. Wilbur Cross, The illusions of Joseph Conrad. — Tucker Brooke, Shakespeare's study in culture and anarchy.

The Journal of English and German Philology. XXVI, 4. Oct. 1927. F. E. Pierce, Romanticism and other isms. — C. M. Lotspeich, A single principle for English and Primitive Germanic sound-changes. — **Id.** The metrical technique of Pope's illustrative couplets. — S. T. Williams, Unpublished letters of Emerson. — A. W. Crawford, Browning's *Cleon*. — G. L. Hamilton, Studies in the sources of Gower. — G. H. Orians, Early American travelers in England. — **Id.** XXVII, 1. Jan. 1928. H. L. Savage, The significance of the hunting scenes in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. — C. E. Cason, Additional lines for Bale's *Kynge Johan*. — C. F. Harrold, The translated passages in Carlyle's *French Revolution*.

Modern Philology. XXV, 3. Febr. 1928. K. G. T. Webster, Two notes on Chaucer's sea-fight. — J. H. Hanford, The manuscript of *Paradise Lost*. — G. L. Marsh, New data on Keats's friend Reynolds.

Anglia. LI, = N. F. XXXIX, 1927, 2. K. Jost, Unechte Ælfricexte. — L. B. Wright, Elizabethan Sea Drama and its staging. — K. Nagel, Wie ein Volkslied wird. [Concerning *Sally in our Alley*]. — K. Kläeber, Zu den Waldere-Bruchstücken. — H. Lange, Victor Langhans und die Unechtheit des F-Prologs in Chaucers Legende von guten Frauen. Eine Abwehr. — E. W. Scripture, Der Lear-Vers oder der englische Doehmius. — P. Fijn van Draat, Damm. — O. B. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur ae. Wortforschung. — H. Conrad, Byrons Vorfahren und Kindheit. — E. Westergaard, Scottish Adverbs. — **Id.** LI, 1928, 3/4, K. Jost, Unechte Ælfricexte. — G. Schleich, Die Sprichwörter Hending und die Prouerbis of Wysdom. — E. Tietz, Das Malerische in Rossetts Dichtung. — W. Marshall, Shakespeares Orthographie. — V. Langhans, Zu Chaucers Traumgedichten und deren Auffassung durch A. Brusendorff. — Leo v. Hübner, Methodisches zur Ermittlung der Schreiberindividualität in mittelhochdeutschen Handschriften. — H. Conrad, Byrons Vorfahren und Kindheit. — **Id.** LII, 1928, 1. S. J. Crawford, The Worcester Marks and Glosses of the Old English Manuscripts in the Bodleian, together with the Worcester Version of the Nicene Creed. — P. E. Dustoor, Textual notes on the York Old Testament Plays. — D. M. Walmesley, The Influence of Foreign Opera on English Operatic Plays of the Restoration Period. — L. B. Wright, Variety-show Clownery on the Pre-restoration Stage. — E. W. Scripture, Die grundgesetze des englischen Stabreimverses. — A. Anscombe, The Name of Mayfield in Sussex. — F. P. Magoun, Anmerk. zum Glossar des Tolkien-Gordonschen 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight'. — O. B. Schlutter, Weitere Beiträge zur ae. Wortforschung. — The same, Bemerkungen zum NED. — E. v. Schaubert, He's fat and scant of breath.

Beiblatt zur Anglia. XXXVIII, 8, 1927. Joh. Ellinger, Zum Gebrauche des Dativs mit und ohne *to* nach den Verben des Gebens und Sagens im neueren Englisch. — **Id.** XXXVIII, 10, 1927. F. Holthausen, Ein Englisches Gedicht in Kymrischer Schreibung; Kymrisch-englische Gebete für die Woche. — **Id.** XXXVIII, 11, 1927. Fr. Kläeber, Weitere Randglossen zu Texterklärungen. — **Id.** XXXIX, 3, 1928. F. Karpf reviews E. Kruisinga, An Introduction to the Study of English Sounds, 4th ed. — **Id.** XXXIX, 4, 1928. E. Deckner reviews *The Merchant of Venice*, ed. by J. Kooistra. — **Id.** XXXIX, 5, 1928. W. Fischer reviews Tuke, The Adventures of Five Hours, ed. by A. E. H. Swaen.

Englische Studien. LXI, 1927, 3. M. Rösler, Leben und Lernen in England im 15. Jh. I. — B. A. Mackenzie, A special dialectal development of O.E. *ea* in Middle English. — K. Arns, Maurice Baring. — H. Richter, Poetische Uebereinstimmungen [Milton-Goethe, Milton-Heine, Shakespeare-Goethe, Shakespeare-Schiller, etc.]. — J. Hoops, Internationale englische Sprach-konferenz in London. — K. Arns, Deutsche Shakespeare-Woche in Bochum. — **Id.** LXI, 1927, 1/2. (Festschrift für Arnold Schröder). J. Hoops, Arnold Schröder. — K. Luick, Emphatische Betonung als Quelle neuer Wortformen? — W. Franz, Ellipse und Bedeutungswandel. — R. E. Zachrisson, Five Years of English Place-Name Study (1922–1927). A critical survey. — O. Ritter, Beiträge zur altenglischen Wort- und Namenkunde. — M. Förster, Die altenglischen Texte der Pariser Nationalbibliothek. — F. Holthausen, Das Wakefelder Spiel von Kain und Abel. — E. Eckhardt, Die metrische Unterscheidung von Ernst und Komik in den englischen Moralitäten. — L. Kettner, Einige grundsätzliche Bemerkungen zu Shakespeares Sturm. — L. L. Schücking, Die Familie bei Shakespeare. — H. Schöffler, Heteronomie der literarischen Urteilsbildung. — B. Fehr, Swinburne und Theodor Opitz. — W. Fischer, Aus der Frühzeit der amerikanischen Anglistik. — R. Imelmann, „Die drie Nüsse“ von Cl. Brentano.

Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen. N. F. 52, 1—2, 1927. G. Schleich, Zur Textgestaltung der mittenglischen Bearbeitung von Susos Orogium Sapientiae. I. — **Id.** N. F. 52, 3—4, 1927. **Id.**, **Id.** II. — F. Liebermann reviews A. Popen, The Ship of Fools. — **Id.** N. F. 53, 1—2, 1928. M. Caspar, Disraeli Vivian Grey II als politischer Schlüsselroman. — R. Tourbier, Experimentell-phonetische Studie über die Gruppe Adverb + Substantiv im Neugriechen.

Germanisch-romanische Monatschrift. XV, 1928, 11-12 (Nov.-Dez.). Includes F. Holthausen, Ein altenglisches Rätsel. [Rätsel Nr. 58 (Trautmann Nr. 55), von Holthausen als „Krähe“ gedeutet.] — **Id.** XVI, 1928, 1/2 (Jan.-Febr.) W. Fischer, Otto Luitpold Jiriczek zum 18. Dez. 1927. — V. Rüfner, Herbert Spencer, der Kant Englands. — F. Pfister, Auf den Spuren Alexanders des Grossen in der älteren englischen Literatur. — W. Marschall, Die Quellen der Polonius-Gestalt im „Hamlet“. — Th. Kalepky, Eine neu erschlossene Shakespearestelle (As you like it III, 3, 13—15). — **Id.** XVI, 1928, 3/4 (März/April). M. J. Wolff, Englische Utopisten der Renaissance: Thomas More und Bacon. — Th. Kalepky, „Die Freude am Tragischen“ — Shakespeare-Aristoteles.

Die neueren Sprachen. XXXV, 5 (Juli-Aug. 1927). G. Wolff, George Tyrrell. — E. O. Paget, Neue Amerikanismen. — **Id.** XXXV, 6 (Sept. 1927). M. J. Wolff, Zu Arden von Feversham. — Ph. Aronstein, Die englischen Knaben-theater und ihr Drama. — A. Macdonald, English Literary Chronicle. — N. Fischer, Neuere und neue Arbeiten über amerikanisches Englisch. — **Id.** XXXV, 7 (Okt.-Nov.) G. Humpf, Eine vergleichende Darstellung der Lehre vom Konjunktiv im Französischen und Englischen. — K. Arns, Deutsche Shakespeare-Woche Bochum (11.—17. Juni 1927). — **Id.** Beiheft Nr. 12a: E. Moosmann, Englische Literaturstunden auf der Oberstufe. Aus der Unterrichtspraxis. — **Id.** XXXVI, 1928, 1 (Jan.-Febr.). W. F. Schirmer, Das Bild Chaucers in der Forschung der letzten Jahre. — W. Franke, Eindrücke von einer Studienfahrt nach Irland. — Mitteilung der Dt. Zentralstelle für Amerikanisch-Deutschen Briefwechsel (Leipzig, N. 22, Teiknerstr. 6.).

Zeitschrift für französischen und englischen Unterricht. XXVI, 1927, 5. K. Arns, Neue Geschichten der englischen Literatur. I. — **Id.** XXVI, 1927, 6. K. Arns, Wilfred Rowland Child. — **Id.** XXVI, 1927, 7. K. Arns, Siegfried Sassoons Nachkriegsdichtung. — G. Becker, Zur Behandlung des Partizips in der englischen Schulgrammatik. — **Id.** XXVI, 1927, 8. K. Horn, The Staff and Scrip von D. G. Rossetti. Uebersetzung u. Erläuterung. — **Id.** XXVII, 1928, 1. E. Weltzien, Galsworthy's Dramen als kulturkundliche Lesestoffe (The Silver Box). — H. Jantzen, Von der 56. Philologenversammlung in Göttingen. (Sept. 1927): Engl.-Amerik. Kulturkreis. — **Id.** XXVII, 1928, 2. H. Ullrich, Nachträge und Ergänzungen zum deutsch-englischen Teile des Muret-Sanders. — Th. Kalepky „Shakespeares Krankheit und Tod“ (concerning the article by Guthmann in Shakespeare-Jahrbuch 61). — K. Arns, Dean Inge. — G. Humpf, Noch einmal: Zur Behandlung des Partizips in der englischen Schulgrammatik. — E. G. Müller, Ueber die Behandlung von englischen Gedichten auf der Oberstufe.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur. LI, 1927, 2. E. Sievers, Ae. me. wel und wöl.

Zeitschrift für Ortsnamenforschung. III, 1927, 1. C. Schererz, Studien zu den Ortsnamen von Cambridgeshire.

Preussische Jahrbücher. 1927, 210, 1. K. Federn, Lord Byrons Nachlass.

Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie. III, 1927, 3/4; IV, 1927, 1/2. V. Zirmunskij, Puškin und Byron.

Literarischer Handweiser. LXIV, 1927/28, 2. K. Arns, Streifzug durch die jüngste englische Prosa. — **Id.** LXIV, 1927/28, 3 (Dez.) F. Schöнемann: Der Amerikanismus in deutscher Auffassung.

Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde. Beiblatt. N.F. 20, 1928, 1. K. Arns, Englischer Brief. — **Id.** N. F. 20, 1928, 2. K. Arns, Englischer Brief.

Eichendorff-Kalender 1927/28. E. Arens, Washington Irving im Rheinland (1822).

Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung. IV, 1928, 2. L. L. Schücking, Zum puritanischen Persönlichkeitsideal.

Die Literatur. XXIX, 1927, 11. O. Forst de Battaglia, G. K. Chesterton. — A. Busse, Amerikanischer Brief. — **Id.** XXX, 1927/28, 1. P. Selver, Englischer Brief. — **Id.** XXX, 1927/28, 2. J. E. Poritzky, Jack London oder: Das Uebermass der Anerkennung. — **Id.** XXX, 1927/28, 5 (Febr.) A. Busse, Amerikanischer Brief. — **Id.** 7 (April). A. Leitch, Der Erzähler [Sherwood Anderson] erzählt sein Leben.

The Taming of a Shrew.

The Taming of a Shrew, 1594, hereinafter called *A Shrew*, is a most marvellous play. The diction is at times Marlowesque, at times reminiscent of Greene. A great part of the plot is the same as in Shakespeare's *Shrew*, and parallelisms of thought and expression between the two plays are numerous. Some lines are almost identical with lines from *Wily Beguiled*, 1606. Moreover there are faults and errors of every kind scattered throughout the play. How are we to account for this bewildering state of affairs? Professor F. S. Boas said in the introduction to his edition of the play, 1908: 'Its provenance is likely to remain one of the insoluble enigmas of Elizabethan dramatic history.'

The Marlowesque part. A few dozen lines are either complete parallels to or echoes of lines and phrases from *Doctor Faustus* and *Tamburlaine*. The first instance we meet on the first page, line numbering as in Praetorius's facsimile:

Lord. Now that the gloomie fhadow of the night,
Longing to view Orions drifling lookes,
Leapes from th' antarticke World vnto the skie
And dims the Welkin with her pitchie breath, Sc. I, 10—13.

These very lines, Tucker Brooke's lines 235/8, appropriately serve Faustus to introduce the conjuring up of a devil. In our play they are used by a gentleman, coming home from a day's hunting, as a preface to his orders to feed the dogs. Such grotesqueness at once leads to the presumption either that the text is highly corrupt or that its author is a very poor dramatist; anyhow, Marlowe cannot have used this speech in this context, and therefore, these lines must have been purloined.

Tamburlaine says to Zenocrate:

Thy perlon is more woorth to *Tamburlaine*
Than the poffeffion of the Perfean Crowne,
Which gracious Itarres haue promift at my birth.
A hundreth Tartars fhall attend on thee,
Mounted on Steeds fwifter than *Pegasus*. I Tam. 286/90.

The idea of horses swifter than Pegasus occurs also in our play:

Wil. And if your honour pleafe to ride abroad,
He fetch you luttie fteedes more fwift of pace
Then winged *Pegasus* in all his pride,
That ran fo fwiftlie ouer the *Persian* plaines. Sc. II, 17—20.

In this text the idea must have been purloined from Marlowe as the connexion with the adjective *Persian* proves; its fantastic use in our play is explained by its author having a confused recollection of the sound of Marlowe's lines.

There are ten other Marlowe parallels but it is not necessary to quote them. The two instances given suffice to show that in *A Shrew* they are plagiarisms and that its writer cannot have been Marlowe. In 1875, in his edition of Marlowe's *Works*, A. H. Bullen sanely remarked how impossible it is that a poet of Marlowe's class should repeat himself in this wholesale manner, but he infelicitously explained the purloinings as burlesque and quoted Swinburne's opinion of their author: 'Of all the pre-Shakespeareans incomparably the truest, the richest, the most powerful and original humourist.' Here Swinburne and Bullen show a bad understanding of the late sixteenth century mind which indulged in extravagant oratory. Greene in his *Menaphon*,

1589, (Arber's Reprint, p. 74) was in sober earnest when he described Samela, that paragon of beauty, as

.....an Eaw amongst our Rams, whose fleece was as white as the hairens that grow on father *Boreas* chinne, or as the dangling deawlap of the siluer Bull, her front curled like to the *Erimanthian* Boare, and spangled like to the woosted stockings of *Saturne*, her face like *Mars* treading vpon the milke white cloudes;...

The same high-sounding rhetoric is heard in *A Shrew* where *e. g.* Kate is described as

.....louelier then Dianas purple robe,
Whiter then are the fnowie Apenis, (Apennins)
Or icie haire that groes on Boreas chin. Sc. VII, 63/5.

And later on we shall see that the general inferiority of this play's text irrevocably excludes Swinburne's theory of humour.

The Shakespearean part. One line of *A Shrew* is the same as line IV, 3, 172 of Shakespeare's *Shrew*, many lines and phrases show a strong affinity to Shakespeare's lines, and the well-known close connexion of incidents and of the plot have caused the pretty general assumption that *A Shrew* was the model on which Shakespeare constructed his own play. When in 1844 Thomas Amyot edited a reprint from the edition of 1594 the title-leaf announced 'The old Taming of a Shrew, upon which Shakespeare founded his comedy'. Strange to say, in this edition there was not a word of argument to substantiate the title's claim. At that time all were agreed that *A Shrew* unquestionably preceded Shakespeare's *Shrew*. Even in 1904, in the Arden edition, Professor R. Warwick Bond wrote:

The counter-suggestion of Mr. Hickson that *The Taming of the Shrew* formed the model of *A Shrew* is one which it is difficult to believe can have commended itself to anybody, so much more fully developed and finished is our play, so far does it surpass the other in fluency and naturalness of dialogue, in the handling of the plot, and in small but telling points of characterisation; while in diction too, and partly in versification, *A Shrew* represents an earlier style.

Professor Bond's summary is quite true but it does not prove the priority of *A Shrew*. Of course, it is possible that the author of *A Shrew* who borrowed from Marlowe may have borrowed from Shakespeare, and that his incapacity produced the inferiority of his work; moreover, it is possible that *A Shrew* represents a piratical text. Why did not Professor Bond mention and meet Hickson's ingenious arguments? In *Notes and Queries*, 1850, p. 345, this scholar decided on the priority of Shakespeare's *Shrew* on account of eight parallels of which he opined that the versions from *A Shrew* could only be explained as derivatives, as corruptions of the passages in Shakespeare's *Shrew*. Not all of them are convincing but, certainly, the following case is unassailable:

Sh.'s *Shrew*, F. IV, 3, 123/7:

Gru. Thou hast fac'd many things.

Tail. I haue.

Gru. Face not mee: thou haft brau'd
manie men, braue not me; I will neither
bee fac'd nor brau'd.

A Shrew, Q. Sc. XIII, 35/9:

San. Doofst thou heare *Taylor*, thou
haft braued

Many men: braue not me.

Thou'lt faste many men.

Taylor. Well fir.

San. Face not me Ile nether be faste
nor braued

Says Samuel Hickson :

In this passage there is a play upon the terms 'fac'd' and 'brav'd'. In the tailor's sense, 'things' may be 'fac'd' and 'men' may be 'brav'd'; and by means of this

play, the tailor is entrapped into an answer. The imitator, having probably seen the play represented, has carried away the words, but by transposing them, and with the change of one expression — 'men' for 'things' — has lost the spirit: there is a pun no longer. He might have played upon 'brav'd', but there he does not wait for the tailor's answer; and 'fac'd', as he has it, can be understood but in one sense, and the tailor's admission becomes meaningless.

Here is another of Hickson's parallels:

F. IV, 3, 135/8:

Tail. Imprimis, a loofe bodied gowne.

Gru. Malter, if euer I laid loofe-bodied gowne, low me in the skirts of it, and beate me to death with a bottome of browne thred: I laid a gowne.

Q. Sc. XIII, 27—30:

Tailor. Item a loofe bodied gowne.

San. Maifter if euer I layd loofe bodied gowne, Sew me in a feame and beate me to death, With a bottome of browne thred.

Sow me in the skirts of it is possible and has meaning, *Sew me in a feame* is impossible and has no meaning at all. The latter is a corruption, and the first must be the original version, for, if we think it out, it is easy to see that the good phrase can be corrupted to the bad one, but it is impossible to think that the bad passage could ever have been the expression of an author's thought. Other instances we forgo. When we find Marlowe phrases in an anonymous play, and when we are able to show that even only one of them is a borrowing, we know that all of them are borrowed and that Marlowe is not the author of the play. When there are several parallels in two plays, and when it is doubtful which has the original version, then, as soon as the priority of one passage can be proved, this proof decides the rest.

The first, as far as we know, who yielded to Hickson's arguments was the late Professor Wilhelm Creizenach in his *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, IV. Bd., 1909, p. 694ff. This scholar supplemented Hickson's textual criticism with an examination of the sub-plot, and was able to show that that story in *A Shrew*, as it was one remove farther off from Ariosto's *I Suppositi*, was derived from Shakespeare's *Shrew*. We have no room for Creizenach's evidence, and refer our readers to the original exposition. Readers of *The Times Lit. Sup.* may consult Mr. P. Alexander's able article in No. 1285, Sept. 16, 1926, p. 614. The faults found by Hickson and Creizenach rightly induced Mr. Alexander to spot our play as a 'bad' Quarto in the sense in which Professor Pollard introduced this expression. And a bad Quarto it is!

The *Wily Beguiled* part. It is Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes's great merit to have discovered the parallels between *A Shrew* and *Wily Beguiled*, see *The Authorship of 'The Taming of a Shrew', 'The Famous Victories of Henry V' and the additions to Marlowe's 'Faustus'*, Sh. Association No. 4, 1920. We cite three of them:

A Shrew, Sc. IX, 49:

He mew her vp as men do mew their hawkes,

Sc. XIV, 28/9:

And I should my loue as erlfe did *Hercules*
Attempt to paffe the burning valtes of hell,

Sc. XIV, 74/5:

And knit in light of heauen this *Gordian* knot.
That teeth of fretting time may nere vntwilt,

Wil. Beg., Hazl. Dodsley, Vol. IX, p. 248:

He mews her up as men do mew their hawks;
p. 306:

Yet would I pass the burning vaults of Ork
As erst did Hercules to fetch his love,

p. 313:

To knit the knot that time can ne'er untwist,
To work his will to knit this Gordian knot:

These parallels seem to Mr. Sykes to be altogether different in character from those between *A Shrew* and the dramas of Marlowe which, also to him, clearly imply plagiarism; these, however, would involve identity of authorship. In what way the character differs he does not argue but Mr. Sykes

may mean these parallels are inserted with better taste and less blunderingly than some of the Marlowe lines. Indeed they are, but why should this imply that they are author's repetitions? It has been known for a long time that the author of *Wily Beguiled* borrowed freely from *The Spanish Tragedy*, that he pirated his scene between Gripe and Lelia from *Rom. & Jul.* III, 5, and reproduced his fourfold repetition of 'In such a night' from *The Merchant of Venice*. What deduction, then, is more natural than that this pilfering author borrowed as freely from *A Shrew*?

Deficiencies. In *A Shrew* Aurelius, son to the Duke of Sestos, takes the rôle of a merchant, and his servant Valeria takes the rôle of Aurelius. As these disguises do not seem to be necessary to the plot, any author would provide an especial motive for them, but in this play no reason is given. Valeria, after being installed as the Duke's son in Scene IV, is in Scene V ordered 'as erlfe we did deuife' (but it was not devised!) to present himself to father Alfonso as a musician 'to teach his eldest daughter on the lute'. He does so. Later on he acts before Alfonso the part of the Duke's son. Of course, this could not have been done, if he had acted before Alfonso the musician's part, nor would it have been possible to do it, if he had not played his princely rôle at once when arriving in town, as was actually at first devised in Scene IV. No author was ever guilty of such incongruities.

We will give another instance of the manner in which some incidents are handled in *A Shrew*. Petruchio's merry jest with Vincentio does not occur in Ariosto's play, it is Shakespeare's addition. When Petruchio and Kate ride to her father's house they overtake Vincentio going to visit his son; they poke fun at him, excuse themselves, explain, and all go together to Kate's house. In *A Shrew* the same joke is broken on the Duke of 'Cestus' but here this incident is without any connexion with the other incidents of the story and betrays impossible contradictions. The Duke comes 'all alone' walking from the isle of Sestos to see his son who is staying at Athens, he meets Kate and her husband, asks the way to Athens, is made fun of, and in his fear hastes away to Athens without knowing the way. After having met his son, he takes leave and restates:

..... I came alone,
And not as did befeeme the *Cestian Duke*,
Nor would I have it knowne within the towne,
That I was here and thus without my traine,
But as I came alone so will I go,

Sc. XVI, 116-120.

His son answers courtly and absurdly: 'Ile bring you to your ship' (Sc. XVI, 126). Of course, this is a corrupt passage, an author does not write in this way.

In the course of this article we have already mentioned divers other defects, and it is needless to try to give a complete catalogue. Still, there is one curious feature of our play we should like to draw attention to, it is the number of objectionable repetitions at short intervals. If well applied, the repetition of words and phrases is a highly effective figure of speech; if wrongly employed, it is annoying. Perhaps we may consider the repeated word *droonken* to be effective in the first sentence of our play:

You whorlon droonken flaue, you had beft be gone,
And empty your droonken panch fome where elfe
For in this houfe thou halt not reft to night.

Sc. I, 1/3.

But the third *bright* is most ridiculous in these lines:

Faire *Emelia* fommers fun bright Queene,
Brighter of hew then is the burning clime,
Where *Phoebus* in his bright aequator lits,

Sc. XIV, 1/3.

Souns appears at least 18 times in the short play of 1532 lines; *straight* at least 11 times, of which we cite three instances and complement them with another repetition:

Bid one or two of them come hither Itraight,	Sc. I, 55.
Go see that you make you readie Itraight,	66.
And Iirha go you make you ready Itraight,	71.
Now Iirs go you and make you ready to.	81.

To (a)wake we find 7 times within 55 lines of the first Scene. Also observable are:

And let a sumptuous banquet on the boord,	Sc. I, 29.
Let heauenlie mulicke play about him Itill,	33.
With heauenlie mulicke founding in his eares,	42.
And such a banquet let before his eies,	43.
..... for Ile lo cram me downe the tarts	
And the marchpaines, out of all crie.	Sc. VIII, 22/3.
..... he thums me out of all crie,	30.
For my Maisters hard at hand	Sc. IX, 2.
They be hard at hand I am Iure by this time.	21.
And make her gentlie come vnto the lure,	Sc. IX, 50.
As hungry hawkes do flie vnto there lure.	55.
..... and then my Maister will courle me	Sc. XI, 17.
Here comes my Maister now hele courle you.	29.

What are we to think of these stylistic flaws? We do not remember any author addicted to such a practice.

Authorship. *A Shrew* has been assigned, wholly or in part, to Greene, Marlowe, Kyd, Shakespeare and an imitator of Marlowe. At this day, knowing that *A Shrew* is posterior to Shakespeare's *Shrew*, all the authors above named can be discarded, and there is no longer any reason for Dr. Ward's suggestion that *A Shrew* represents a Marlowesque revision of a yet older play. There remains the imitator of Marlowe, endowed by Mr. Sykes in his above-mentioned pamphlet with the name of Samuel Rowley. This actor was the author of *When You See Me, You Know Me*, or etc., printed in 1605, and he may be the author of part of the additions to *Doctor Faustus* for which Henslowe paid £ 4 to William Birde and Samuel Rowley; no other products of his pen are known to exist. Now, Mr. Sykes asserts that the distinctive marks of Rowley's vocabulary are found in the prose scenes of *A Shrew*, which would imply Rowley's authorship. Of course, this assertion can only be substantiated by bringing forward the literary hall-marks which *When You* and *A Shrew* have in common. The 1616 additions to *Faustus* cannot be taken into consideration because the discrimination between Rowley and Birde is an unsolved problem in itself; moreover, we are not certain at all that the 1616 additions are those Henslowe paid for. The printed *Faustus* text of 1604 contains only some 1500 lines, it seems to be abbreviated, and the additions of 1616 may belong to Marlowe's original text.

Let us examine all the remarkable resemblances between *When You* and *A Shrew* Mr. Sykes claims to have found. His first clue is *soun(d)s*. Though this expletive is expurged from Shakespeare's Folio (only once, in *King John* did it escape Heminge and Condell's vigilance) it is very common in the dramatic literature of the time, for instance, in the 'good' Shakespeare Quartos we find it 25 times, of which there are six cases in *Othello* and ten in the *First Part of Henry IV*. In *A Shrew* it occurs no less than 18 times, in *When You* 4 times. As a distinctive mark of a writer's vocabulary

such a common word can never do duty. In this case, though we should not like to press the argument, there is some reason to think that it is not in Rowley's manner to give this expletive indiscriminately to eight different characters as is done in *A Shrew*. The four occurrences in *When You* are limited to one character, and this may be deliberate just as it must have been planned by Rowley to give the oath *Mother a (of) God* 17 times to the character of King Henry VIII, and add to it six times the variant *Gods holy mother*, three times *Gods mother*, twice *Gods deere Lady*, and once *Gods Mary Mother* obviously to characterize the King's English. His subjects do not use it in *When You*.

Mr. Sykes's second clue is *I warrant you (thee)*. He himself says 'No doubt it was in common use at the period'. Therefore, it cannot serve for a distinctive mark. It occurs 15 times in *When You*, 8 times in *A Shrew*, and 12 times¹⁾ in Shakespeare's *Merry Wives*. If its excessive use was Rowley's hall-mark there is no reason to make its eightfold appearance in *A Shrew* a point for Rowley's authorship.

Mr. Sykes's third clue is *O brave!* In *When You* it appears doubly as 'O braue, ô braue' at p. C 4 and singly at p. G 3 of the Tudor Facsimile of the 1613 edition; in *A Shrew* it occurs four times. Now, when Marlowe has:

Is it not braue to be a King, Techelles?
Ufumcafane and Theridamas,
Is it not paffing braue to be a King,
And ride in triumph through Perlepolis!

I *Tam.* 756/9.

and perhaps leads the way with the interjection:

Oh, braue, mafter! I worship your nofe for this.

Jew of M. 938.

what peculiarity is there in the reiteration of that interjection by several other dramatists, Shakespeare included? Nor is there any specific value in Mr. Sykes's 'corroborative evidence' as he calls it. He has found *ast paffes* and *as paffes* in *When You*, *as paffeth* and *as it paffeth* in *A Shrew*; *ye had beft* in *When You*, *you had beft* thrice in *A Shrew*; *hard at hand*²⁾ once in *When You*, and twice in *A Shrew*. These expressions are not at all rare, therefore, they are not typical, and more evidence Mr. Sykes does not bring. When he advances the facts that Rowley in *When You* only once used *ye had beft* and *hard at hand*, only twice *O braue* and *as paffes*, and only four times *founs*, he has effectively proved that these words and phrases are no pets of Rowley's and no hall-marks of his authorship. If it were not too common an expression we might, perhaps, accept *I warrant you* as a pet phrase but, unfortunately for Mr. Sykes's view, it is not exceptionally frequent in *A Shrew*. After all, is there anything particularly striking in the fact that two Elizabethan plays have in common six of the many hundreds of obsolete words and phrases which belong to the vocabulary of that bygone time?

Epilogue. Hickson and Creizenach have proved that the ground work of *A Shrew* is the primary *Shrew* of Shakespeare. This is the main fact we have to reckon with. Scarcely less important is another fact that most of the discrepancies we have mentioned are not to be ascribed to the author but that they are recognizable or can be explained as actors' mistakes. When

¹⁾ Only eight times according to Bartlett's *Complete* [sic!] *Concordance*, but in this work the cases at II, 2, 68; 72; 76; and 79 are not mentioned.

²⁾ This expression occurs in *I Tamburlaine*, Tucker Brooke's line 643, and it seems to have been a favourite with Peele.

a player is not part-perfect he is liable to wrongly repeat words and phrases, see the repetitions we have advanced; besides, he will introduce fragments and echoes of other parts he is accustomed to speak or to hear, or even phrases from a book he has read, see the cases we have brought forward and remember the stilted and conventional diction. Then, occasionally, an actor is subject to a slip of the tongue: how easily the nonsensical words 'Sew me in a leame' do drop for 'fow me in the skirts of it'. Then again, he will transpose his words as we see in Hickson's parallel where the pun is lost, here the transposition is primary, and the easy repetition of 'men' for 'things' secondary, and not necessarily an actor's mistake.

In 1594, according to the title-page, the actors of *A Shrew* were Pembroke's men, and their frequent citations of Marlowe's lines show that they or some of them had acted in *Tamburlaine* and *Faustus*. These plays belonged to the Admiral's troupe but this fact does not run counter to our deduction. Says Sir Edmund Chambers in *The Elizabethan Stage*, 1923, Vol. II, p. 3: 'Actors are a restless folk, and the history of the Admiral's men will show how constantly their business organisations were disturbed by the coming and going of individuals, and by the breaking and reconstruction of the agreements on which they were based'. And on p. 6: 'The plague-years of 1592-4 brought disaster, chaos, and change into the theatrical world. Only the briefest London seasons were possible. The necessities of travelling led to further combinations and recombinations of groups, one of which may have given rise to the ephemeral existence of Lord Pembroke's men'. However this may be, we know with certainty that Pembroke's men possessed Marlowe's *Edward II*, which they sold to the printer William Jones. It was registered on 6 July 1593, and published the next year. In the same year 1594 the first Quarto of *Titus Andronicus* was printed with the statement on the title-page that it had been acted by Derby's (Strange's), Pembroke's, and Sussex's servants. *The True Tragedy* is the only other play of which we know with certainty that it belonged to the repertory of Pembroke's company. That this troupe had friendly connexions with Marlowe and Shakespeare cannot be doubted; Halliwell-Phillipps suggested that Shakespeare had been a member of it.

Heminge and Condell have informed us that there existed divers stolen and surreptitious Quartos of Shakespeare's plays. We think there are three methods of stealing a play: either the MS. or a transcript of the MS. may be got in an unlawful way, or the play may be taken down by a shorthand reporter from the oral delivery on the stage, or the play may be reconstructed from memory; besides, some combination of these methods is more or less thinkable. The first method of pirating does not come into consideration for it can never be proved by internal evidence. In this case the pirated play rests on the printing of the original MS. or of a transcript of it, just as is the case with all legitimate prints, and the result can never be a copy 'maimed and deformed by the frauds and stealthes of iniurious imposters'. Only when oral delivery dependent on memorization is a link between the original MS. and the printed issue is there occasion for a distorted printed play. An exact presentment of a play is scarcely possible, it is inconceivable in Elizabethan days when long runs did not exist and want of precision was a predominant factor of the time. The histrionic glory of a Tarlton, an Alleyn, a Burbadge and a Kempe may have been deserved to the utmost degree but this does not mean that they were part-perfect in our sense of the word. On the contrary, it is certain that some actors even purposely deviated from their prescribed text. And, of course, every actor was liable

to omit, to vary, to repeat, to transpose, and to slip in his utterance. We have advanced more than enough of these actors' defaults to establish the fact that *A Shrew* had passed through the stage of oral delivery, and consequently that it is a piracy. Such a piracy, as Shakespeare's contemporaries have informed us, was made up from stenographic notes taken during the performance of a play. Sermons were 'taken by Characterie' and printed as early as 1589. Not only mistakes of the spoken text but also many stage-directions provide us with convincing evidence that they were written by an utter outsider who knew nothing of the play but came to hear, to see, and to note. Here is the first stage-direction when the play before Sly begins, Sc. III: 'Enter two yongg Gentlemen, and a man and a boie'. Of course, the note-taker was not yet acquainted with the names of the characters, he wrote down what he saw, and afterwards he forgot to correct this stage-direction into some such form as an author would have used, for instance: *Enter Aurelius with his man, and Polidor with his boy*. This not knowing and not catching of a name, pronounced on the stage, is, as we have argued in our *Hamlet* book, a possible reason for the change of names Corambis and Montano for Polonius and Reynaldo; in *A Shrew* it affords a simple explanation of the impossibility that the character Valeria played both the musician's and the father's part before Alfonso. Aurelius must have ordered another servant of his and not Valeria to personate a musician, and this other servant's part, we presume, had to be played by the actor who personated Valeria. The note-taker not catching that other servant's name but recognizing Valeria credited Valeria with that other servant's part.

A third method of piracy is the reconstruction of a play from memory. Another man's memory does not specifically differ from an actor's, nor will his texts display defects of memory essentially different from an actor's elocution. Neither can the stenographer be spotted by specific faults, the so-called 'errors of the ear' *Cestus* for *Sestos* or *gallon* for *Galen* occur abundantly as misprints and miswritings. Therefore there is no short reliable method of differentiating a shorthand piracy from a memorizer's piracy. Still, the occurrence of slips of the tongue points, though indirectly, to shorthand origin because the stenographer in writing out his notes is performing a more mechanical task, he has the tendency to stick to his notes as his highest authority; the memorizer, on the other hand, will write much more in the manner of an author, he will carefully correct his own slips and try to correct those which may hang in his memory. Still more, the occurrence of such a stage-direction as we have above quoted, points to a note-taker who, starting work, did not know the play, whereas it speaks strongly against a memorizer who knows the names of the characters when he begins to write. The best argument in favour of the assumption of the pirating memorizer is Spanish. In her *Dramatic Publication in England 1580—1640*, 1927, p. 312 Miss Albright mentions a contemporaneous nobleman Luis Ramírez de Arellano, who took 'from memory an entire comedia on hearing it three times, without the slightest variation either in plot or verses. The first day he devotes to the general disposition of the plot, the second to the variety of the composition, and the third to the exactness of the verses. In this manner he commits to memory any comedia he desires.' Evidently, this Don's memory was better than the eye of the Elizabethan composer. No doubt, had there been such an English 'paragon of Animales', or anything like it, our forbears would have told us. They, however, are absolutely silent about pirating memorizers, they tell us the plays were taken by 'Brachigraphy men'. And we wonder how it is that any critic, in the teeth of these positive statements of the men who could know, can have

the courage to adhere confidently to a hypothesis hanging in mid air. Positive statements of eyewitnesses may be erroneous but the critic who challenges them has the duty to prove that they are wrong. Nobody has tried to do so. Yet, the critics of to-day are simply satisfied with their established and inherited disbelief in a shorthand pirate. They say, it is not possible that Burbadge delivered Hamlet's famous soliloquy as it stands in the surreptitious Quarto, and there an end! No, there is not yet a beginning, such an objection proves that the problem is not understood. It is not the question whether an actor could have spoken such a maimed and deformed speech, but whether such a text could be the result of an actor's (faulty) delivery combined with the shortcomings of a stenographer in taking notes and working them up.

Of late years English scholars have tried to saddle the piracy upon an actor who, in possession of his own authentic part, complemented the rest of the play from memory. As there were divers surreptitious plays (seven of Shakespeare's: *Wives*, *L. L. L.* ¹), *Hen. V.*, *II Hen. VI.*, *III Hen. VI.*, *R. & J.* and *Ham.*) there is an *a priori* improbability, if not impossibility, that there were so many pirate actors who liked to risk their vocation and to do the uncongenial job for a remuneration that must have been inadequate. Then, their hypothesis preadmits, as *conditio sine qua non*, an essential and strongly marked difference between the accuracy of the text of one rôle against all the other parts, and this difference does not exist, see our *Hamlet* book, p. 68! These leading scholars themselves even prove the non-existence, for Messrs. Pollard and Dover Wilson conclude that the pirate actor of *Hamlet* was the man who took Voltemand's part, and Messrs. Gray and Crompton Rhodes, equally positive, conclude that the pirate played Marcellus. Then again, an actor is an insider, if anyone next to the author understands a play and its technique, it is he. On the spur of the moment any mistake is possible, but we think it extravagant to credit an actor with all the faults the surreptitious Quartos swarm with. On the stage he may make many of them, when writing that is scarcely possible, but if he does, he is able to correct most of them just as any writer corrects his work. What actor could have written the stage-direction *Enter a Bragart Gentleman* for *Enter a Courtier* at *Ham. V, 2, 80*? It is an outsider's report of what he saw on the stage! Again, is their hypothesis tenable against the testimony of those who could know?

The shortness of the surreptitious Quartos has given rise to the belief that they in some way or other represent abbreviated texts for provincial playing. This belief has no sound basis. There is no reason whatever why the players should not speak as much in the country as in London, and why the countrified people could not enjoy as much as the Londoners were treated to. Shortened texts for touring would only be reasonable if the plays were pruned of the rôles least necessary. In that case the number of actors and the travelling expenses could be reduced. As it happens, the lists of *dramatis personae* in the pirated versions are intact, or nearly so, and, as a fact of great importance, we read on the title-page of the pirated *Hamlet*: 'As it hath beene diverse times acted by his Highnesse seruants in the Cittie of London.' With regard to *A Shrew* Furnivall remarked: 'Even with doubling several of the parts, *A Shrew* would require about ten men and four boys.' Shakespeare's *Shrew* did not want more.

Elsewhere we have set forth the fact that the pirated *Hamlet* is just short or long enough for performance. Shakespeare's text is twice as long, it could

¹) See *Textual Criticism of Shakespeare's Plays*, this periodical, August 1925.

not have been performed without most serious curtailment, and such a cutting down of the play involves other important changes. Who made them? The author may have helped, but as a rule the actors did it 'as occasion led them' says Humphrey Moseley, the publisher of Beaumont and Fletcher's Folio. Taking in due consideration the difficulty of curtailment, their errors, and the stenographer's errors, as we have done in our *Hamlet* book, the oneness of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* with its caricature, the surreptitious version, is lucidly explained.

A Shrew is a play reported by an outsider, but this does not explain the relation between its text and Shakespeare's *Shrew*. It is impossible that Pembroke's men played Shakespeare's *Shrew*, and that *A Shrew* is a report of it. Taking for proved the priority of Shakespeare's play, it is obvious that nearly the whole scheme of *A Shrew* and some small part of the wording have been purloined from Shakespeare. In our days this would be called a literary theft, but Queen Elizabeth's time had another mentality. In his *King John*, for instance, Shakespeare purloined just as much from the scheme of *The Troublesome Raigne* though less of the wording. The wholesale pilfering of words and expressions from Shakespeare and Marlowe goes far to show *A Shrew* cannot be an author's brain-work, this and its many glaring actors' faults point to actors' impromptu. Is it conceivable that the whole play was something like an improvisation of the actors? Mr. P. Fitzgerald wrote in *The Gentleman's Mag.*, 1885, p. 185: 'Even so late as the days of the old Victoria Theatre, the actors often performed a play with little more to guide them than notes of the situations and topics, filling in the dialogue from their own invention.' The days of Newington Butts furnish no certain information but sundry facts are indicative. Rhyming contentions on the stage and improvisations in verse are recorded. Meres praises the actors Tarlton and Wilson for 'extemporal witte'. At *I Hen. IV*, II, 4, 309 Falstaff asks: 'Ihall we haue a Play extempory?' Cleopatra at *V*, 2, 216/7 says to Iras: 'The quicke Comedians Extemporally will flage us, ...'

Pembroke's men must have been a splendid company when they performed at court on 6 January 1593. Thereafter came the plague, and in the summer of the same year they travelled and sold their *Edward II* to a printer. On 28 September Henslowe wrote to Alieyn: 'As for my lorde a Penbrokes w^{ch} you delier to knowe wheare they be they are all at home and hauffe ben this V or sixe weackes for they cane not laue ther carges wth travell as I heare & weare fayne to pane ther parell for ther carge'. Taking into account that they played *Titus Andronicus* and *III Hen. VI* it is acceptable that they owned Shakespeare's *Shrew* as well, and, in their great misery, they may have sold this play to Strange's (Chamberlain's) men. If so, well, they had to live, ... could they not have revived Shakespeare's *Shrew* by changing the names of the characters, altering the plot a little, especially the courting of Bianca, and by each actor contributing more or less extempore the wording of his part? They would not by doing so have offended contemporary ethics of their profession, and this all-explaining assumption would clear up the baffling relation between the two *Shrews*.

If we are right, Shakespeare's *Shrew* must date from 1592 or earlier. There is nothing against this. Before we had made the above study we doubted now and again Shakespeare's authorship, we did not recognize his rhetorical, gnomic, and poetical style. Dating the play as early as we have done, we gladly and repentantly submit to the great authority of Heminge and Condell who included the *Shrew* in their Folio of 1623.

The predicative Passive Infinitive.

1. The use of the passive infinitive in modern English, and the various cases in which the older 'gerundial' infinitive, active in form, but passive in meaning, is still used, or may be employed (there is nothing *to see* — *to be seen* — there; a house *to let* — *to be let*, etc.), are discussed in detail by Poutsma in Ch. LV of his *Grammar*, particularly in §§ 68-89.

Very little has been written about the history of the passive infinitive. Mätzner, *Grammar* III, 34, says, "The infinitive of the passive is an innovation in the cases cited (i.e. in quotations from modern English), it does not become usual in Old-English (i.e. Middle English) till subsequently". He gives two instances, one from Wycliffe, and one from the so-called *Coventry Mysteries*. He goes on to say, "The infinitive of the active of transitive verbs is else generally used". — Kellner, *Syntax*, § 365, makes the following, more definite statement, "In Middle English there is a faint beginning of creating new passive constructions of the infinitive after the Latin type; but before the Elizabethan age the modern construction is not completed".

2. The object of the present paper is to deal with the history of the predicative passive infinitive in sentences like, *What is to be done? The work is to be done at once; There is still some work to be done.*

The material required for the study of the O.E. predicative inflected infinitive with a passive sense, i.e. the infinitive with *to*, preceded by *beon* (*wesan*), from which the modern predicative passive infinitive has descended, is found in Callaway's exhaustive book, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, Ch. VII, A 1. Callaway states that he has found about 894 examples of "the inflected infinitive denoting necessity or obligation and passive in sense . . . of which only ten examples occur in the poetry" (p. 98). He expresses his opinion as regards the origin of the construction as follows, "it seems to me highly probable that . . . the construction was first suggested by the Latin" (Ch. XVI, VII.).

How many of the 894 instances of the predicative "passive" inflected infinitive belong to the type that yielded the modern construction *it is to be done* cannot be gathered from Callaway's statements. In classifying and grouping the thousands of infinitives dealt with in his book, he naturally looked at them from an O.E. point of view, without paying attention to their further history.

3. The construction we have to start from in accounting for the modern predicative infinitive of the passive voice, is illustrated in the following quotations, taken from my own collections, and supplemented by examples given by Callaway, l.c. pp. 98-101.

Bede (Schipper), 327.3223, ... hæfdon betwih him spræce and geþeahte, hwæt *to donne wære* *Læceboc*, 62.21, ðas ðing *sint to donne*. *Greg. Dial.* 109.18, ðæt *nīs na mid swigunge to forlætanne*. *Blickl. Hom.*, 29, Geþencean we eac, gif oþer nyten *wære to haligienne*. *Wulfst.*, 270.16, ðas feower sinoðas *syndon to healdenne*. *Doomsday*, 9, *nīs ðæt lytulū spræc to geheganne*. *Blickl. Hom.*, 63, þa demand *beoþ swiþor to herigenne* þonne *to leanne*. *Greg. Dial.*, 146.2, ic þe bidde, cwyst þu, hwæþer hit *to gelyfenne sy*. *Blickl. Hom.*, 209, þonne *is to gelyfenne* and gearo *to witenne*. *Ælfr. Lives of S.*, I, 100.176, se god *is to gelyfanne*. *Id. Ibid.*, I, 478.93, *Nīs nan oþer god on to gelyfenne*. *Laws*, Liebermann, I, 254.29, eal swylc *is to leanne* and næfre *to lufianne*. *Ælfred, Past. C.*, 13.20, on oðre wisan *sint to manianne* weras. *Ælfric, Lives of S.*, I, 310.38, *Georius þa befran . . . hwæðer is to lufigenne* oððe hwam lac *to offrigenne*. *Id., Ibid.*, II, 8.103 f. hit (= þæt geat ðæs mynstres) næfre *næs to geopenigenne*.

Boeth., 41.3, Ðæt is nu hraðost to secganne, ðæt *Metres Boeth.*, VI. 6, ne bið awuht to gesettanne wið þære sunnan leoht. *Blickl. Hom.*, 19, Eac is to gedencanne hwæt Drihten spræc. *Ælfric, Hom.*, II, 270, nis forði nan ðing ðæron to understandenne lichamlice, ac is eall gastlice to understandenne. *Psalm LXXVII.* 10, nis to wenanne, þætte *Ælfred, Past. C.*, 157.14, Eac is to wietanne ðæt *Ælfric, Pref. Genesis*, 24.16, Is eac to witanne, þæt sume gedwolmen wæron. *Id. Lives of S.*, I, 458.284, Is swa ðeah to witanne þæt *Blickl. Hom.*, 197, . . . se þe is on ealra ymbhwyrfta to weorþienne and to wuldrienne. *Sol. Aug.*, 12.17, Eala hu þin godnes is to wundrienne. *Blickl. Hom.*, 33, Nis ðæt to wundrigenne. *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, 26, Seo eorðe is to wundrienne.

4. The construction illustrated in the above quotations is the only one in use in Middle English until about 1300. When the 'modern' construction 'it is to be done' had come into existence, the older one kept its ground. I will only give a few early instances; very little is to be gained by battering in an open door.

Orm, 6144 f., loc þatt tu ne tæle himm noht þohh þatt he beo to tæle. *laz.*, A. 14518, þat was to iwitene. *Sawles Warde*, O.E. *Hom.*, I, 255, hwet is in euch þing to cheosen ant to schunien. *S. E. Leg.*, 201.66, he scholde be him do: ase bi swuch a man was to done. *Robert of Br., Handl. S.*, 7413 f., Pou lewed man, knowest also what ys to lete, what ys to do. *Id., Ibid.*, 7569, hyt ys nat to drede.

5. It is peculiar that the inflected infinitive, which otherwise is generally, if not always, active in meaning, should have come to be used in a passive sense in Old English, Old High German, and Old Scandinavian, in spite of the fact that these languages had a genuine passive infinitive as well.

In Old English the passive infinitive is used

I. subjectively:

Luke, XIII, 16, ne gebyrde hyre beon unbunden of ðissum bende on restedæge? *Ælfric, Lives of S.*, II, 198.125, swa ðe eac gedafenað to efstanne . . . and . . . beon gecostnod.

Not frequent; see Callaway l.c. p. 26.

II. objectively; a. with active finite verb:

Greg. Dial., 204.4, ðonne hi gewilniað fullfremede beon. *Mark*, XIII, 4, hwilc tacen bið ðænne ealle ðas ðing onginnað beon geendud?

Not frequent; see Callaway, l.c. p. 71.

b. with passive verbs:

Greg. Dial. 203.23, ðæt he nane ðinga næs gelyfted beon gefylled.

Rare; see Callaway, l.c. p. 72.

III. with auxiliaries:

Greg. Dial., 232.7, be ðam ne dorste us nan wen beon geduht. *Blickl. Hom.*, 19, heo mihte beon acenned. *Læceboc*, 19.14, mæg wesana sio wund gehæled. *Ælfric, Lives of S.*, I, 270.142, he ne mot beon tuwa gefulod. *Orosius*, 20.33, ðonne sceolon beon gesamnode ealle ða men. *Blickl. Hom.*, 77, ðæt seo burh sceolde abrocen weorðan and bereafod. *Ælfric, Hom.*, II, 48, ne ðearf he beon eft gefulod. *Matth.*, II, 18, heo wolde beon gefrefred.

There are many instances; see Callaway, l.c. 83 ff.

IV. after [w]uton:

Ælfric, Lives of S., I, 242.68, Eala ge gebroðra uton beon gehyrte.

Found only three times; see Callaway, l.c. p. 95.

V. in the accusative with infinitive construction:

Bede (Schipper), 25.448 f., bæd Scs. Albanus fram Gode him wæter seald *beon*. *Greg. Dial.*, 194.18, ða het he ðysne biscop *beon gælæd* to ðære stowe. *Ælfric, Lives of S.*, I, 250.215, læt me *beon geseald* to heora getele. *Bede* (Schipper), 20.294 ff., he hine þa geseah on singalum gebedum and wæccum . . . *beon abysgadne*. *Andreas*, 361, Æfre ic ne gehyrde ðon cymlicor *gehladdenne* (*beon* understood).

Not frequent; see Callaway, l.c. p. 120.

6. It will have been noticed that the Old English passive infinitive is never preceded by *to*. In early Middle English the original meaning of this preposition had become so much weakened, that it was employed very extensively, not to say generally, as a means of connecting an infinitive with a verb of complete predication, a noun, or an adjective, preceding it. Hence even in early Middle English the passive infinitive, except, of course, when preceded by an auxiliary, is accompanied by *to*. The following quotations, taken from texts dating from the latter part of the twelfth to the middle of the thirteenth century, contain instances of the passive infinitive preceded by *to*:

I. used subjectively:

Orm, 2375 f. swa summ i þatt ald Nass lazhe *to ben fesstnedd*. *Hali Meidenh.*, 15.21, him Punched *to beon overcumen*. *Gen. and Exod.*, 2427 ff., So was him lif *to wurðen leid* Quor ali gast stille hadde Him . . .

II. used objectively:

Lamb. Hom., p. 135, in halie chirche þere alle cristene men agen *to ben isomned* to gedere; cf. *Trin. Hom.*, p. 155, in chirche þer al chirche folc ohg *to ben gadered*; *Trin. Hom.*, p. 55, Þerfore we agen alle *to ben shrifene* of ure synnes. *Vices and Virt.*, 37.16 f. him self lið on sume heaued-senne, ne ðo ne wile læten, ac hoped *to bien iborezen* ðurh ðat he dieð swa michel for godes luue. *Orm*, 10392 f., Ne nohht ne drazhe icc upponn me *to ben* bridgume *nemnnedd*; cf. *Ibid.*, 18460 f., I ne drazhe nohht ome . . . *To wurrþenn* forr bridgume tald. *Ibid.*, 11174, I Cristess hus Þurh Cristess þeoww He foþ *to wurrþenn fullhtnedd*.

7. The adnominal passive infinitive does not seem to occur in Old English; it came into use in the Middle English period. The earliest instances of this construction I have found, occur in *Orm*, namely, 347 f., þatt streon þatt wass Allmahhtiz Godd . . . & lac *to wurrþenn offredd* her O rodetreowwess allterr, and 12644 ff., he till hiss Faderr wass Offredd forr uss o rode, All alls he wære *an lamb to ben offredd*.

Although from a grammatical point of view an adnominal passive infinitive is different from a predicative one, it really has the same function; 'a lamb to be sacrificed' means the same as 'a lamb that is to be sacrificed'.

8. The passive infinitive of purpose is also unknown in Old English. *Matthew XX*, 28, 'Filius hominis non venit ministrari' is rendered in West-Saxon by 'mannes sunu ne com þæt him man þenode'. Wycliffe has, 'mannes sone came nat for to be serued', Purvey, 'to be servyd', Tyndale, earliest edition, 'to be mīstred vnto', Coverdale, 'to be serued', the *Authorized Version*, 'to be ministred vnto'.

Here, again, *Orm* appears to be one of the first to make use of what was an innovation in early Middle English. He employs the final passive infinitive several times: 10662 f., & tu, min Laferd, cumesst her Att me *to wurrþenn fullhtnedd*? 13972 f., swa to winnenn uss att himm þurh himm *to wurrþenn hezhenn*. Instances are also found in 13986 f., 13994 f., 16640 ff., 17924. f.

Further examples:

Trin. Hom., p. 157, welnehg ech man zifeð his almesse.... *for to ben wurded* fer and ner. *Woh. of ure Lauerd*, *O.E. Hom.*, I, p. 279, Broht biforen sinfule men.... of hem *to beo demet*. *Gen. and Exod.*, 2685 f. summe flen, Into saba *to borgen ben*. *Passion of our Lord*, *O.E. Misc.* 27 f. De holy gost hyne ledde.... *For to ben yuoned*.

9. So far no early instance of a passive infinitive with *to* in the accusative with infinitive construction has turned up. Examples of the plain infinitive in this construction are met with here and there.

In Middle English the accusative + passive infinitive is sometimes employed in cases where it would be impossible, or at any rate, unusual in Modern English. The following quotations also show that usage was not always settled as regards the plain and the prepositional infinitive. Further investigation is necessary.

a. 1375. *Lyff of Adam and Eve*, Horstm., *A. E. Leg.*, p. 221, which of zou seið me *be maad*

a. 1440. *Prose Life Alex.*, 30. 27 f. he saw his cuntree.... *be destroyed*

a. 1400. *Towneley Pl.*, 385. 559 I wold make them *be knowne*

1460-70, Malory, *Morthe Darthur*, 146.1 f., This is a dooleful syghte / to see the yonder knyghte so *to be entreted*.

c. 1400 *Maundev.*, p. 145, He made him *to ben delyvered* out of prison.

1457, Rymer, *Fædera*, XI, 579, he shall make the seid Seal *to be putte* ageine into the Bagge, and the same Bagge.... *to be sealed*.

1463. *Paston L.*, No. 473, peraventure I schal make hym *to be meved* in the matter here after.

10. The object of the above somewhat lengthy remarks is to show that by about the middle of the thirteenth century congruity as to function and form had come to be the rule in the case of the passive infinitive. The predicative infinitive, however, was always active in form, although it might be either active or passive in sense, cf. *Orm* 9267, 'þatt irre þatt *to cumenn iss*', and Rob. of Br. *Handl. S.* 8482, 'þe olde man wyst nat what *was to do*'. The circumstance that the passive sense of what was originally the inflected infinitive (of a transitive verb), was not expressed by any distinctive form, while otherwise passivity was reflected in the language, must have been felt to be an anomaly. If this psychological factor had not asserted itself, no innovation would probably have been introduced, any more than in Dutch ('Het is niet te doen'). Foreign influences cannot have been at work, for the predicative passive infinitive is a peculiarity of the English language.

11. As has been remarked (section 4), the predicative passive infinitive did not make its appearance until after the thirteenth century. The first instance I can give is found in Robert of Brunne's *Handlyng Synne*. This translation was made in 1303, but the oldest MS dates from about 1360, so that the possibility of the scribe having introduced the 'novelty' has to be reckoned with. The new construction soon became fairly usual. In order not to take up too much space I will only quote fourteenth and fifteenth century examples.

1303 (MS. 1360) Robert of Br., *Handl. S.*, 1546, þey beð *to be blamed* eft þarfore.
1377-81 Chaucer, *Boethius*, II, pr. I, 99 f. The manaces of Fortune ne ben nat for to dredden, ne the flateringes of hir *to ben desired*. III, pr. VIII, 35 ff. The which hevene, certes, nis nat rather for thise thinges *to ben wondred upon*, than.... III, pr. XI, 170 ff., Thou hast shewed me wel that over thilke good there nis nothing more *to ben desired*. IV, pr. II, 259 f., all power is *to be noumbred* among thinges that men oughten requere.

- c. 1388 Purvey, *John*, XXI, 25, I deme neither the world him self to mowe take the bookis, that *ben to be writen*.
Id. *Apocal.*, VI, 12, thei schulden reste zit a litil tyme, til the noumbre of her felowis and of hir britheren ben fulfilled, that *ben to ben slayn*.
- c. 1410 *Lant. of Lizt*, 56.15, as a clene mirour of lijf þe lessoun of hooli writ is to be had (= accepted). 29.28 f., Þei schulden be stille.... til her felowis be comen / & her briþeren þat *ben to ben slayn*.
- beg. 15 c. *St. Antony, Anglia* IV, 118.40 Mekyll ert þu for to be dysspyesd.
- c. 1420 *Pall. on Husb.*, Contents XXVI, Lande is not to be balked. Cont. XXVII, Molde is to be moeved about a roote. Cont. XXVIII, Olyve is to be planted of children. 26.712 ff., unto the modres lore *Is to be lefte* that thai may with her children Laugh and be gladde. 45.43 f., Ffeyngrek to have of seede is to be sowe In Ytalie ene (= only) in this Janes ende. 136.891 ff. A stalon asse ybolked, brawny, sadde, And large ylymmed, strong, and steyth, alle blak or mou[s]hered or reede is to been hadde. 198.302, Iche daies IX a wyne (= vine) is to be moeved.
- c. 1430 *Arte of Nombryng*, 11, Euery part of the nombre multiplying is to be had into euery part of the nombre to be multipliede.
- 1449 *Pecock, Repressor*, p. 13, God is moost to be loued of men. p. 41, which eend is for to be couplid and oonid in God. p. 187, whi and wherfore God chesith this place.... is not of men to be enquerid. p. 233, not ech philosophie neither ech doctrine which is after elementis of this world is to be fled. p. 231, the firste premysse.... is to be denied for untrewre. p. 250, the nakid affermyng of the writer and maker of thiik book of Sapience.... is not so myche to be bileuid neither so myche to be cleued to as.... p. 433, it is to be argued ferther.... p. 503, Thiik thing or gouernance.... is to be kufft away. p. 515, the seid religious *ben not to be kutte* away fro the chirche. p. 515, a litil synne is more to be eschewid and to be fled, than is a ful greet goostli good, which is not of Goddis comaundement.... and the gretter synne is euer more to be fled and eschewid than the lesse synne.
- c. 1450 *Ludus Cov.*, 88.195, here is to be maryde a mayde zynge.
- 1456 *Paston Letters*, No. 267, ye know and can devyse best what ys to be doon.
- 1460 *Reg. Oseney Abbey*, 75.9, [that] Þese thynges of both parties *beth.... to be kepide*, we have.... behestid.
- 1461 *Paston L.*, No. 430, send me word, and weder it dyvers fro trespass and dette, wher damages is to be recovered, for in this appell is no damages to be recovered.
- 1463 *Ibid.*, No. 473, it is full hard to my self to determine the certaynte of every circumstans of the mater, and it is not gretely to be comuned of with other.
- 1469 *Ibid.*, No. 609, my desert upon every behalfe it is for to be thought ther shulde be non obstacel a yenst it.
- 1483 *Ellis, Orig. Letters*, II, I, XLIX, what is ferther to be doen in this matter.
- 1498 *Letters etc.*, *Rich. III* and *Henry VII*, p. 78, and p. 79 (twice) it is to be presupposed that....
- 1493-1500 *Medwall, Nature*, I, 137, I may.... well dyscerne what ys to be done; I, 300 ff., he may well dyscerne and fynde suffysant dyfference bytwyxt good and bad Whyche ys to be left and whyche ys to be had. I, 1432, It were not to be don.
- 15 c. *Prose Leg.*, *Anglia* VIII. 111.36, I trowe þat hit is to be committid alle to god. 118.20, hit is to be notyd þat....; 118.41, Þere is zit mykel to be writen of this mater. 136.9 ff., Þof þe body be to be constreyned to serue þe spirite.... neuer þes we woot þat.... Certainly, necessaryes are not to be wiþdrawen fro þe pore fleshe, but vices are to be refreyned.
- 15 c. *Orologium Sapientiae, Anglia* X, 387. 20, To the disciples also of wisdame is to be worschepyd specially þat worþy moder of þe souereyne Kynge....

12. The above quotations contain upwards of fifty instances of the predicative passive infinitive; further search would probably bring a good many more to light. In sixteenth century writings examples are plentiful;

from a few texts dating from the first half of the century I have collected more than thirty.

It is worth noting that some fifteenth century writers rarely use the new construction; Occleve and Bokenam seem to avoid it. Still the material adduced undoubtedly justifies the conclusion that by the end of the fifteenth century the predicative passive infinitive had acquired the status of a regular, recognized construction. The following passages taken from *Lesclarcissement de la langue francoyse*, 1530, Génin's reprint, p. 411, show that it was regarded as such by the grammarian Palsgrave: "For, "it is to be noted" they saye nat *il est a estre noté*, but, *il est a noter*, and for "it is to be doubted", *il est a douter* And in every of the signyfycaciouns do the frenche men, for an infynityve passyve in our tongue, use an infynityve active, as And it is to be consydréd, *et faict a considerer*. It was to be doubted, *il faisoit a doubter*."

13. In Old English the predicative inflected infinitive is frequently accompanied by a personal dative, as, Ælfric, *Homilies*, I, 314, *hwæt is us to donne?* This means literally 'What is [there] for us to be done?' Here are a few more typical examples:

Blickl. Hom., 199, he hine lare beahsodon, *hwæt him Pæs to donne wære*.

Wulfstan, 173. 4, hi dydon swa *him to donne wære*.

Bede (Schipper), 39. 321, hi *Peahodon and ræddon, hwæt him to donne wære, and hwær him wære fultum to secanne*.

Laws (Liebermann), I, 368. 84, smeage swyðe georne *hwæt him sig to donne, and hwæt to forganne*.

Blickl. Hom., 81, Eac *us is to ongytene Pæt hie cwædon, 'Hæl us on eorþan . . .'*

Ibid., 29, *Us is to gelyfenne Pæt he Pyder come . . .*

Læceboc 63.17 f., *Hwæt him sie to forganne . . . , hwæt him sie to healdanne ge on læcedomum ge on mete forþon is þearf micel, Pæt . . .*

Past. Care, 261.3, *Him is to secgeanne ðæt hie unablinnendlice gedencen . . .*

Blickl. Hom. 33, *Ac us is to smeagenne Pæt Drihten on Pære costunge nolde his Þa myclan miht gecupan*.

Ibid., 27, *Pæt us is to gebencenne, Pæt ure Drihten æfter Þæm fulwihte fæstte*; similar instances are found *Ibid.* pp. 29, 31, 33, 35.

Ibid., 63, *us is to witenne Pæt Preora cynna syndon morþras*; similar instance in Ælfric, *Hom.* I, 110.

The same construction is found in Middle English. It is peculiar that *to do* figures in all the instances I have come across so far.

1121-2 *Chronicle*, 1083, Þe munecas . . . nyston *hwæt heom to donne wære*. (Thorpe translates 'what they were to do').

c. 1175 *Lamb. Hom.*, 91 *hwet is us to donne*.

c. 1200 *Sawles Warde*, O. E. H. I, p. 253, rihte us, and reade *hwet us beo to donne*.

c. 1200 *Laz.*, A 4767 f., radden *whet him weore to donne*.

Further examples of the same type are found in *Orm*, 2946 ff. and 10105 f.; *Juliana A*, p. 36 = B p. 37; *Hali Meidenh.*, p. 37; *South Engl. Leg.*, 169.2189 f. and 170.2238; *Robert of Glouc.* (Hearne), p. 115; *Judas Iscariot*, Furnivall, *E. E. Poems*, 20 and 48; *Kyng Alis.*, 466 f.; *Amis and Amil.*, 1276.

14. In this idiom the 'gerundial' infinitive was not replaced by a passive infinitive. Owing to the same causes, probably partly grammatical, partly psychological, that brought about the transition from the 'impersonal' to the 'personal' construction, the dative was replaced by a nominative, the result being 'I am to do it'. I can only adduce one Middle English instance of the new construction.

- c. 1380 Wycliffe, *Sel. Wks.*, I, 120, he wist what *he was to do*.

The following two examples belong to a different category:

- c. 1382 Wycliffe, *Gen.* XIII, 17, *I am to zyue it to thee*. (daturus sum).
1493-1500 Medwall, *Nature*, II, 179 f., yet *I was for to seke* you at the other
side of the water.

The infinitives in these two examples are the descendants of Old English active inflected infinitives, examples of which are found in Old English prose, especially in Ælfric's works: *Us is to secenne* ... *ða bote at gode* (*Lives of S.*, I, 376.181).

One might be inclined to ascribe the origin of 'I am to do it' partly to the analogy of the synonymous idiom 'I have to do it', but this collocation made its appearance at a comparatively late date. The earliest instance given by the *O.E.D.* (i.v. *do*, 33, c) is dated: ? a 1500. It was, however, in use at least a century earlier:

- a. 1400 *Pride of Life*, 283 f., *doztely to done a dede þat ze haue ffor to done*.
c. 1420 *St. Editha*, 4805, *þat blessud virgyn wist fulle welle what he (= she) hadde to done*.

The reason why early instances of 'I am to do it' are rare, is that the subject and the 'copula' (query: is it a copula?) are generally suppressed, if the idiom occurs in a dependent clause.

- MS. c. 1400 *Robert of Glouc.*, 9237, MS. B., *He nuste wat to do*.
a. 1450 *Ysumbras L.*, 550, *wyste he neuer what to do*.
1443 *Bokenam, Legends*, 22.620, *I noot lengere what to doon her*.
1463 *Paston L.*, No. 480, *I wot not what to do with him*.
1483 *Plumpton Corr.*, p. 44 *they know not what to do*.
Ibid., p. 93, *I wott not what to say*.

15. The subject in the idiom that has just been discussed, is sometimes qualified by 'best', as: *Augustine's Soliloquies* 2, 25, *hwilc good him were betst to donne*, and *hwilc yfel betst to foreletende*, with which compare: *Bede* (Schipper), 150.995 f., *he smeade . . . hwæt him selest to donne wære*.

I have noted the following Middle English instances:

- c. 1200 *Orm*, 2944, *Josæp sohhte raþ . . . Off whatt himm wære betst to don*. Similar instances *Ibid.*, 2904 and 2949.
c. 1300 *Amis and Amil*, 1276, *He nist, what him was best to don*.
1393 *Gower, Conf. Am.*, II, 306, *What thing him were best to do*.

The following quotation, taken from Chaucer's *Troil. and Cr.*, IV, 83 f., is interesting: *I com my-self in my propre persone To teche in this how you were best to done*. Is *to done* intransitive here, so that the idiom means 'how it would be best for you to act?' Or has 'what' been replaced by 'how', owing to the fact that in Chaucer's time 'What you (dative) were best to do' was, perhaps subconsciously, felt to be equivalent to 'what ye (nominative) were best to do'? The latter suggestion is based upon the circumstance that in fourteenth century English the dative was beginning to be extensively replaced by the nominative.

As to examples of 'what I am best to do', the earliest I can give are about a century later than Chaucer's time:

- 1483 *Cron. Englonde*, *He wyste not what he was beste to do* (*O.E.D.* i.v. *do*, 4).
1509 *Bp. Fisher, Works*, p. 292, *She . . . doutfull in her mynde what she were best to do asked counsayll*.
Id. Ibid., same p., *to beseche him to put in her mynde what she was best to do*.

This is the wording in Wynkyn de Worde's edition. The M.S. has 'what were best for hir to do'. The same construction, with a dative substitute, is also found in Medwall's *Nature*, II, 1002 ff., canst thou tell Now in thys case what *were best for vs to do?*

16. In concluding this paper it may not be inappropriate to mention the prepositional infinitive in *-ing*: He . . . demed þe juges *to dyzing* (Horstmann, *A. E. Leg.*, 30.247). This infinitive is a characteristic of the dialects of the south-western counties, i.e. the Southern part of the West Midlands, and the western part of the South. As might be expected, it is also used predicatively in a passive sense.

2nd half 13th cent. *Usages of Winchester*, E¹, 2, 1, *þat is to wetynge* þat þer be in þe town by-fore y-seyd meyre. E² (14th cent.) has the same wording. The same expression in 24. 2, both texts.

1387 Trevisa, Extr. in Emerson's *Reader*, 223. 12, now it *is to declarynge* how þe Pictes were destruyd.

1419 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, I, XXI, At the makýng of this Letter yt (= the ship) was in this estate, that ys *to wetyng* XXXVJ strakys in hyth.

There is also an instance in the *North English Legends*, where one would certainly not expect to meet with this construction.

Es Pis Pat to *vndirstande* is (77.45).

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

Erratum. The sentence beginning 'There is an earlier one' on p. 72, line 7, of the June issue of *English Studies* was meant for a note.

More Soft Palate and Nasality.

The actions and functions of the soft palate or velum are a vexed question in phonetics. A couple of years ago I wrote an article which dealt with this subject at large¹⁾. For those of my readers who are not acquainted with it a summary may serve by way of introduction, in hopes that they may be induced to take cognizance of the article itself. It was intended for linguists and discussed questions in which they may be supposed to take an interest.

After describing the manner in which the soft palate shuts off the nose-passage, and old theories anent this closure, I called the attention of the reader to the three arches in the mouth, placed behind each other like wings on the stage: "The anterior one stands a little behind the last of the back teeth, and, for the purpose of this article, interests us only, inasmuch as it forms the limit between the two palates. Behind it are the other two arches, the narrower one at the back of the other, and called palatopharyngeal and palatoglossal arch respectively. The entrance to the mouth thus formed is called the fauces; in it hangs the uvula. The sides or pillars of these arches are movable, fleshy, membrane-covered folds, which become vertically

¹⁾ The Soft Palate and Nasality, *Neophilologus*, 1926, 207—218 and 277—278. The reader is requested to make the following corrections in it:

p. 211, line 17 from top "external auditory" for "auditory";

" " line 37 " " "will not maintain" for "will maintain".

stretched, when the soft palate rises. The pillars of the palatopharyngeal arch can, moreover, approach or recede from each other, thus respectively narrowing or widening the arch."

Other questions then passed the review, as the position of the soft palate and uvula in the condition of sleep, in breathing, in yawning, in the falsetto-voice, in so-called clear and gradual beginning and [h], in non-nasal speech-sounds, and the means of ascertaining whether the nose-passage is hermetically closed or not.

Next followed the second part of my self-imposed task, viz., nasality, its nature and origin. As not all nasal sounds have necessarily nasal quality, I was obliged to propose the use of the following terms to avoid misunderstanding.

1. *pure* sound; with air-tight closure of the nose-passage by the velum.
2. *nasal* sound, the *nasalness* of a sound, and, if necessary, *to nasal* a sound. Absence of nasal resonance, though the nose is entirely open at the back.
3. *nasal twang*, *to speak through the nose* (not the effect of a cold in the head).

4. *nasalized* sound; the *nasality* or *nasal quality* and *nasalization* of a sound; *to nasalize*.

As in the French vowels of *dans*, *son*, *fin*, *un*.

2, 3 and 4 *nose sounds*.

Then I discussed the size of the orifice to the back of the nose-cavity and concluded on the strength of experiments by Passavant and Panconcelli-Calzia that *the nasalization of a speech sound is independent of the distance between the velum and the back of the pharynx*.

As I know by experience that in studying phonetics especially beginners attach great importance to the question whether in the pronunciation of [m] and [n] there is communication between the mouth and the nose, I next discussed humming with closed lips and respectively locked jaws and lowered nether jaw. The conclusion I arrived at was that *nasalization is dependent on*¹⁾ *communication between the mouth and nose-cavity*, for it requires, as will be shown below, the whole of the supraglottal passages (larynx, pharynx, mouth, and nose), *and also on the narrowing of the aperture on both sides of the uvula*.

[m] and [n] are usually not nasalized, though nasalization is possible, viz., when the uvular orifice, while maintaining the communication between the mouth and the other cavities, is narrowed. To the ear the difference is not very great, because the closed mouth forms but a small resonance-chamber. In this connexion I may quote Paget's remark in a private letter to me: "I have found that it is possible to produce a wide range of sounds between entirely non-nasal and strongly-nasal quality when humming through the nose with the lips closed and *the tongue well kept down*"²⁾.

The [ŋ] in *king* stands apart: the communication between mouth and nose-cavity is entirely shut off by the back of the tongue pressing against the palate. In this case nasalization is out of the question, because, as has been said, it requires the cooperation of the larynx, pharynx, mouth, and nose, with, besides, the orifices at the uvula and the nostrils.

After warning the student in passing that nasal twang should not be confused with what is popularly called "speaking with a cold in the head",

¹⁾ It may be advisable to point out that "is dependent on" does not mean "is generated by", but merely expresses that without communication between the mouth and nose-cavity and narrowing of the aperture between them there can be no question of nasality.

²⁾ My italics.

which has pathological causes, I tried to give an answer to the question: Where is nasality or nasal quality generated? In doing so, I followed closely Grützner's¹⁾ exposition of the same subject, and came to the following conclusion:

In pronouncing a nasalized vowel, e.g. [ɛ̃] in French *fin*, the larynx is not specially raised, the soft palate approaches the back of the tongue, the aperture on both sides of the uvula is very small, and behind it, in the mesopharynx, an additional resonance-cavity of small size is formed by the back wall of the pharynx and the palatopharyngeal folds. The volume of air in the larynx, pharynx, mouth, and nose combined is now set vibrating by the action of the vocal chords, and to the multiple resonance thus produced is added the resonance of the small cavity just described, with its narrowed uvular aperture. The vibrating air necessarily passes out at the nostrils and the lips. In the nasal twang the contraction of this aperture is less pronounced.

As to the nature of the nasal quality it is now generally believed — though the theory has been disputed — that it is due to a high frequency note. In this connexion I may be allowed to quote Stumpf²⁾:

“Experimentell hat sich uns ergeben, dass das Charakteristische der Nasallaute in gewissen Lücken unter ihren tieferen Teiltönen und in der Beimischung von Teiltönen aus der 4-gestrichenen Oktave liegt. Diese Züge bleiben aber auch der unmittelbaren Wahrnehmung bei geschärfter Aufmerksamkeit nicht ganz verborgen. Man braucht nicht lange zu suchen, um in Naselnden Klängen etwas Hohes, Dünnes und selbst eine Art Hohlheit zu entdecken, worauf denn auch schon Helmholtz hingewiesen hat”.

According to the orthodox theory, nasalization is generated in the nasal cavity. Among those who still hold this view I may mention Burger, who in an article³⁾ dealing amongst other things with this subject, says on p. 1564: “Paget and Eijkman are of opinion that nasality has nothing to do with resonance in the nasal cavity. According to Paget the nasal quality is a question of the addition of a high frequency resonance due to the formation of an additional resonating cavity of small size somewhere between the vocal chords and the nasal cavity”.

This is an abridgement of my original text, of which Burger's is a sufficiently accurate Dutch translation. Only I would like to point out that the first sentence should be read in connexion with the whole article that preceded it, and clearly means that nasality is not generated in the nasal cavity as such, for, as has been stated above, there can be no nasality unless the vibrating air passes through the nose and out at the nostrils.

Then Burger goes on to say: “In their opinion the mouth-cavity serves as such (i.e. additional resonating cavity of small size) in the pronunciation of a strongly nasalized [m] or [n]”.

Evidently the writer has misunderstood my meaning, owing to the fact that he does not appreciate the interest of the average linguistic phonetician in the question whether or not in [m] and [n] there is a communication between the mouth-cavity and the pharynx.

¹⁾ Dr. P. Grützner in Dr. Hermann's Handbuch der Physiologie, 1879, I, II, 123-126.

²⁾ Carl Stumpf, Die Sprachlaute, 1926, Berlin, 258.

³⁾ Prof. H. Burger, Open neusspraak en gespleten gehemelte. Nederl. Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde, Jrg. LXXII, 1928, Eerste Helft, No. 13. — The title shows that the writer treats the subject chiefly from a pathological point of view, whereas I consider exclusively normal conditions. It would be advisable to invent different names for these two kinds, e.g. abnormal and normal nasality.

The crux of Burger's statement is contained in the few sentences immediately following, of which the almost literal translation runs thus:

"I cannot share this opinion at all. I am convinced that the nasal quality is caused by the resonance of the nasal cavity as such. If I speak forcibly, with the nostrils slightly¹⁾ closed by pinching them between forefinger and thumb, I feel in every nasal speech-sound the strong vibrations against the inner wall of my nose. If I say *jongen*, with prolonged *ng*, I feel the vibration of the nasalized *ng* high up in the nasal cavity. In pronouncing the French *mon* with emphasis I also feel very clearly the strongly nasalized *o* in the walls of the nasal cavity. The form of the nasal-nasopharyngeal cavity, especially that of its two orifices (the external nose, the soft palate), is responsible for the nasality."

If we confine ourselves to normal speech and normal organs, the second sentence of this quotation clashes with the first part of the statement made higher up, on p. 1563, that "normal *m* and *n* do not make any nasalized impression whatever on our ears, whereas they sound with nasal quality, when they are pronounced with pinched nostrils". In sounding normal [m] and [n] the nasal passage is open at both orifices and consequently comes in for a share of the multiple resonance; yet there is no nasal quality. The second part of this last quotation we need not discuss, for nobody pinches his nostrils in ordinary speech; however, I would remark, also in refutation of Burger's other observations, that, if I lay my forefinger lightly on one of my nostrils, I feel the vibrations of the air not only in pronouncing [ŋ] of *jongen* and [ɔ̃] of French *mon*, but also in [m] and [n]. And indeed, this is self-evident. The column of air in the whole of the supraglottal passages set vibrating by the action of the vocal chords, passes through and out of the nose, in so far as it does not escape through the mouth; consequently it is only natural that the voice-vibrations, modified by the supraglottal passages and conveyed through the nasal cavity, should be felt at the comparatively small orifice of the nostrils. We get the same, though less strong, sensation, when we lay the forefinger on the lips in pronouncing [ũ], i.e. nasalized [u], still more so in pronouncing ordinary [u]. In these two instances the mouth-cavity has a very small opening at the lips. In pronouncing [m] and [n], I also feel the voice-vibrations at the lips and the alveoles respectively, provided the uvular aperture is open. The more forcibly we speak in all these cases, the greater will be the amplitude of the vibrations, and consequently the stronger will be the sensation.

In addition to this I may observe that, if nasal quality consists in the superposition on the voice-waves of a high frequency note²⁾, it cannot be felt at the nostrils, for their walls, owing to their soft, flaccid substance, do not respond to it, no more than the comparatively thick membrane of an ordinary tambour records vibrations of a high frequency³⁾. In the same way the fact may be accounted for that, in speaking the vowel of French *fin* on a low note, I feel the vibrations with my finger on the nostril very distinctly, whereas, if I pronounce it on a falsetto note I feel hardly anything, and in whispering the word, nothing at all. So it is evidently the vibrations of the vocal chords, conveyed by the column of air to the nostrils, that Burger feels. Nasal quality is essentially a question of hearing, not of feeling.

To sum up. The lowering of the soft palate as such does not bring

¹⁾ I take it that by "toegeknepen" is not meant "entirely closed".

²⁾ According to Stumpf somewhere between c_4 and b_4 (2112-3960 half vibrations).

³⁾ Zwaardemaker and Eijkman, *Leerboek der Phonetiek*, p. 30, 1928.

about nasal quality, for not every speech-sound formed with lowered velum is necessarily nasalized. The nasal cavity being of constant volume and practically of constant orifice at the nostrils, its natural resonance can only be changed to a relatively small degree, namely by the varying in the size of its orifice to the pharynx. Nasal quality is generated somewhere between the vocal chords and the back of the nose.

Since Burger omits to give an answer to the question what change, according to him, the nasal cavity undergoes to generate nasality in normal circumstances, and a more plausible theory than mine has not been advanced by any one else, I am entitled to my opinion that it finds its origin in a small resonance-chamber, with a small aperture to the mouth, behind the uvula, i.e. the mesopharynx.

The Hague.

L. P. H. EIJKMAN.

Notes and News.

De Opleiding van de Taalleraar. Evenals in 1927 was ook dit jaar een belangrijk gedeelte van de 29 Mei gehouden jaarvergadering der *Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen* gewijd aan de kwestie van de opleiding voor het leraarsambt. Na een inleiding van de heer K. R. Gallas, lektor aan de Gemeentelijke Universiteit te Amsterdam, getiteld: „Hoe kan de a.s. leraar prakties gevormd worden voor zijn taak?” werd besloten een kommissie van drie leden te belasten met de samenstelling van een adres aan de Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal, waarin er op zou worden aangedrongen in het aanhangige wetsontwerp op het Voorbereidend Hoger en Middelbaar Onderwijs alsnog bepalingen op te nemen ter regeling van deze opleiding. De kommissie, bestaande uit de voorzitter der Vereniging, Dr. H. W. J. Kroes, Dr. E. Kruisinga en de heer K. R. Gallas, kon reeds 15 Junie j.l. het adres verzenden, waarvan een beknopte inhoudsopgave hier volgt.¹⁾

Na gewezen te hebben op de aktie van de leraren in de wiskundige vakken (zie ook E. S. 1927, bl. 113), op de benoeming van een lektor in de methodiek en didaktiek der klassieke talen vanwege het Genootschap van Leraren aan Gymnasia, en op het artikel van de oud-rektor van het Amsterdamse Gymnasium, Dr. A. Poutsma, in het Weekblad voor Gymnasiaal en M. O. van 30 Mei 1928, gaat de kommissie voort:

De grondslag van de opleiding van de leraar moet ongetwijfeld een zo breed mogelijke wetenschappelijke inleiding zijn tot het vak dat hij bestemd is te onderwijzen. Daarover bestaat slechts één mening; maar toch behoort naar het oordeel van ondergetekenden, in overeenstemming met herhaaldelijk ook in de vergaderingen van de Vereniging van Leraren in de Levende Talen uitgesproken bezwaren, vooral ook tegen het universitair onderwijs, ervoor te worden gezorgd dat deze zo gewenste brede wetenschappelijke opleiding niet wordt verkregen ten koste van wetenschap die een leraar voor zijn onderwijs behoeft. Zo kan een wetenschappelijke verdieping in een gedeelte van het vak, hoe waardevol ook, nooit het feit goed maken dat de leraar de taal of literatuur die hij moet doceren, onvoldoende kent. Dit geldt met name van de levende talen omdat de leraar die in de klas moet kunnen gebruiken.

Wat de vakopleiding in engere zin betreft, deze omvat volgens de kommissie drieërlei:

1. Elementaire psychologie en opvoedkunde, in het bijzonder in verband met de omgang met leerlingen van de leeftijd van twaalf tot achttien jaar;

¹⁾ Het volledige adres is opgenomen in het *Weekblad voor Gymn. & M. O.* van 11 Julie 1928.

2. Didaktiek en methodiek van het speciale vak dat de kandidaat-leraar zal onderwijzen;

3. Het bijwonen van de lessen van ervaren docenten en het geven van proeflessen onder toezicht van die docenten (stage).

Hoofdzaak is het onder 2 genoemde onderwijs in de didaktiek en methodiek, dat gegeven zou moeten worden door docenten die zelf in actieve dienst zijn.

Ten slotte behandelt het adres de regeling van de sankties voor een dergelijke opleiding.

Het ligt voor de hand dat het examen in de elementaire psychologie en opvoedkunde, en in de methodiek en didaktiek, gemakkelijk kan worden ingevoegd bij het bestaande en ook in het aanhangige ontwerp gehandhaafde staatsexamen voor leraar bij het midd. en voorb. H. O. (het examen B). Wat de stage betreft, daarvoor zou een getuigschrift moeten worden overgelegd, getekend door de docent en de betrokken inspecteur.

De commissie is dan ook voor afschaffing van de effectus civilis der universitaire diploma's, en acht het gewenst dat alle kandidaat-leraren zich zullen onderwerpen aan hetzelfde staatsexamen, d.w.z. het examen B met aangevuld programma.

Het voorbeeld van de artsexamens toont aan dat de effectus civilis, hoezeer ook bevestigd door een lange traditie in de lit. en wisk.-natuurw. fakulteiten, voor de universiteit geenszins een noodzakelijkheid is. Bovendien zou door afschaffing van de effectus civilis de Minister ontheven worden van de moeilijke taak om te bepalen welke voorwaarden aan een fakulteit moeten worden gesteld om voor de verlening van doktoraal diploma's in een bepaald vak in aanmerking te komen. Het is immers bij de ingewijden van algemene bekendheid dat er aan sommige universiteiten op dit gebied door onvoldoende uitrusting van de fakulteit toestanden heersen die in geen geval mogen worden bestendigd.

Het Instituut der Biezoondere Leerstoelen. In de vorige jaargangen van dit tijdschrift is het instituut van de „biezoondere” hoogleraren herhaaldelijk besproken, en met name het misbruik dat er in de letterkundige fakulteit van de universiteit te Utrecht van gemaakt is. Ook elders is de zaak ter sprake gebracht, o.a. in het Vaderland van 16 Februarie 1928 (De Verwording van de Utrechtse Universiteit) en van 2 Mei 1928 (Van Kwaad tot Erger). Als er onder onze lezers zijn geweest die twijfelden aan de gegrondheid van onze kritiek, zullen dezen wel tot andere gedachten komen bij het lezen van het wetsontwerp door de Onderwijsraad aan de Minister aangeboden (24 April 1928). De bedoeling van het ontwerp is in hoofdzaak om „misbruiken te keeren” en wat die misbruiken zijn wordt duidelijk gezegd, zo duidelijk dat men zich verbaast dit onomwonden in een officieel stuk aan te treffen. De toepassing van de bepalingen omtrent biezoondere hoogleraren is, naar de Memorie van Toelichting verklaart, soms zodanig geweest, „dat het wetenschappelijk karakter van het universitair onderwijs er niet door wordt bevorderd. Zoo schijnt het kwalijk denkbaar dat het onderwijs door hoogleraren, hoe bekwaam ook, die naast hun universitair arbeid pl.m. 30 wekelijksche lesuren aan gymnasium of hogere burgerschool in een andere gemeente hebben te geven, en bovendien nog andere cursussen verzorgen, een voldoende wetenschappelijk karakter kan dragen, terwijl toch het publiek geneigd is een dergelijk fragmentarisch onderwijs als volwaardige opleiding te beschouwen. Ook kan niet worden ontkend, dat aan de waardigheid van het Nederlandsch hooger onderwijs wordt te kort gedaan, wanneer

het gegeven onderwijs wordt bekostigd, hetzij rechtstreeks of zijdelings door een vreemde mogendheid, hetzij door de studenten zelf, die aan den betrokken hoogleeraar cursusgelden moeten betalen". Het is duidelijk dat dit alles in de eerste plaats betrekking heeft op de „biezondere" hoogleraren in de letterkundige fakulteit te Utrecht. De poging om de misbruiken aan de universiteit in dit opzicht ontstaan te bestrijden wordt door ons met ingenomenheid begroet, ofschoon wij, evenals de Utrechtse hoogleeraar Kernkamp (in *De Amsterdammer* van 23 Junie j.l.) van mening zijn dat de uitwerking niet groot zal wezen. Het komt ons voor dat de Onderwijsraad één stap verder had moeten gaan, en had moeten voorstellen dat voor vakken geëxamineerd door „biezondere" hoogleraren geen onderwijsbevoegdheid wordt verleend. Zulk een effectus civilis is overigens ook volstrekt in strijd met de bedoeling die Dr. Kuyper indertijd met het instituut der „biezondere" hoogleraren heeft gehad, en zeker niet in het belang van het middelbaar en voorbereidend hoger onderwijs.

Wijziging Examenprogramma Middelbare Akten. Bij K. B. van 30 Mei 1928, Staatsbl. no. 194, zijn in het programma van de examens middelbaar onderwijs Frans, Duits en Engels de volgende wijzigingen aangebracht. Bij de examens A en B vervalt de bepaling dat vreemdelingen, die verklaren de Nederlandse taal niet machtig te zijn, de vertaling kunnen vervangen door een opstel en een paraphrase van een gedicht in de taal waarover het examen loopt.

Voor de akte A wordt de volgende bepaling ingevoegd: „Het maken van een opstel in de taal, waarover het examen loopt, en/of van een schriftelijke vertaling van een niet te gemakkelijk stuk proza uit de vreemde taal in het Nederlandsch. De examencommissie beslist, of een opstel, dan wel een vertaling zal worden opgegeven, of wel beide; van vreemdelingen wordt in elk geval een vertaling geëischt".

In het tweede lid van het programma voor de akte B vervallen de woorden „mondeling of", terwijl wordt ingevoegd de bepaling: „Het maken van een schriftelijke vertaling van een niet te gemakkelijk stuk proza uit de vreemde taal in het Nederlandsch". Deze wijzigingen treden in werking met 1 Januari 1929. (*Weekblad M.O.*)

Naar aanleiding van het bovenstaande is de vraag zeker gewettigd of de Minister enige maatregel heeft genomen of denkt te nemen om te bevorderen dat ook bij de doktoraal-examens, die dezelfde bevoegdheden geven als de middelbare akten, rekening wordt gehouden met de eisen van de school? Zolang het doktoraal-diploma onderwijsbevoegdheid verleent, moet men de konsekwenties daarvan aanvaarden.

Reviews.

The Poems of John Philips edited by M. G. LLOYD THOMAS.
The Percy Reprints, No. X. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1927.

As none of Philips's poems appeared with his name during his life-time, it is difficult to gain absolute certainty regarding the authorship of poems which were afterwards ascribed to him. Miss Lloyd Thomas gives in this

edition *The Splendid Shilling*, *Bleinheim*, *Cyder*, the Latin *Ode ad Henricum St. John*, with two English translations which appeared in 1714 and 1720 respectively, and *Cerealia*, which she considers to be almost certainly Philips's work. It seems likely that he should himself have written this parody on *Bleinheim*. We know that he did not consider this task-poem a success; in fact, it was painful to him to hear it mentioned. It was written at the request of the Tory ministers Harley and St. John, and Philips thus found himself unwillingly pitted against Addison, who had paid his Whig tribute to the heroes of the battle in *The Campaign* earlier in the same year.

The editor doubts if Dr. H. G. de Maar, whose *History of Modern English Romanticism* appeared while this book was passing through the press, is right in identifying *A Panegyrick Epistle to Sir R. B. on his most Incomprehensible Poem call'd Advice to the Poets*, with Philips's "verses against Blackmore", to which Elijah Fenton alludes. Philips's reply may have got lost, and the *Panegyrick Epistle*, which is written in the heroic couplet, may be the work of one of the other writers attacked by Blackmore in what Dr. de Maar calls this "early Dunciad".

In the Introduction Miss Lloyd Thomas discusses the place that Philips holds among parodists. With him, she says, parody was "a form of discipleship"; it was parody to pay homage. If this statement wanted any corroboration, it would be found in the fact that Philips's serious poems are also written in the Miltonic metre and style; and in the poet's allusion to his master in *Cyder*, that poem which initiates the long series of didactic blank verse poems that the century was to produce. Here Philips, bewailing Milton's political opinions, naïvely asks his Muse to

. abstain
Nor blast his Fame, from whom she learnt to sing
In much inferior Strains

Throughout the eighteenth century references to Philips as "the matchless Bard", "the Splendid Bard", "his enchanting Tongue", abound. Addison calls *The Splendid Shilling* "the finest burlesque poem in the British language", but this was not saying much, for what were the poem's competitors? It appeared eleven years before *The Rape of the Lock*. Thomas Tyrwhitt, the Chaucer scholar, translated *The Splendid Shilling* into Latin. Thomas Tickell ranks Philips with Milton as poet, above Milton as man; this, of course, relates to Philips being a Non-Juror. But Philips's college friend Edmund Smith outdoes all these panegyrists by his *Elegy on John Philips*. Even in his last hours, he says, the poet displayed his easy wit, so that he was (like his own medlar in *Cyder*) "delicious in decay"! Surely, Philips deserved neither that excess of honour, nor this indignity.

The nineteenth century saw Philips with different eyes. Wordsworth is hardly just to the descriptive parts of *Cyder* when he condemns all the poetry between Milton and Thomson as not having been written "with the eye of the poet constantly fixed upon the subject". Campbell, saying that *The Splendid Shilling* is a parody, adds that *Bleinheim* is . . . also a parody, although not meant for one! "The effect produced by Philips", says M. Léon Morel, "is never Miltonic". It is not easy to account for a failure of this kind, and it is wonderful that in Philips's own time we find some one hinting at the hidden ailment. Milton, says Pope in his Postscript to the *Odyssey*, does not use "his exotic words and phrases everywhere alike; but employs them much more where the subject is marvellous vast and strange . . . than where it is turned to the natural and agreeable, as in the pictures of Paradise, the love of our first parents, the entertainments of Angels, and the like".

Philips himself gives a humorous estimate of his *Splendid Shilling* in the Dedication to the poem, which he sent to his friend William Brome in acknowledgement of the pound of tobacco which the latter had given him on receiving the poem. William Brome was reluctant to show this dedication to Bishop Rawlinson; for "it is in MS. & a great banter upon me and not fit to be seen". However, we are grateful to Brome for conquering his scruples and to Miss Lloyd Thomas for reproducing this delightful piece here. "In this age", says Philips, "dedications are not only fashionable, but almost necessary. Those who have no friends dedicate to all good Christians God help those Henpeckt writers that have been forced to dedicate to their own wives." — As for the moral of the poem, he has "took a particular care that it should lye incognito Yet however excellent this poem is, in the reading of it youll find a vast difference, between some parts and others which proceeds not from your humble servants negligence but diet, this poem was begun when he had little victuals and no moneys, and finished when he had the misfortune at a Vertuous Ladies house to meet with both."

The edition, with its good introduction and careful, elaborate notes, bibliographical and explanatory, will hold a worthy place among the Percy Reprints.

The Hague.

A. C. E. VECHTMAN-VETH.

German Influence in the English Romantic Period, 1788-1818.
By F. W. STOKOE. XI + 202 pp. Cambridge University Press,
1926. 12 s. 6 d.

The student of literature is often confronted by the problem of the origin and growth of literary phenomena. In all the other branches of science and art the study of action and reaction is recognized as an indispensable accessory to a clear survey of the whole. And nothing is more absorbing than to trace the evolution of form and idea in literature on an international basis, not in the last place to the teacher. Literary history should be treated horizontally, not vertically. Mediaeval romanticism, allegory, the rise of the drama, the development of the novel, the domestic drama of the 18th century, the romanticism of the 18th and 19th centuries are some of the subjects which should be approached on a plan of international co-ordination.

Any attempt to pave the way in that direction deserves to be welcomed and the material collected by Mr. Stokoe is another proof of the necessity of the study of comparative literature. His General Introduction may be accepted as a clear exposition of Romanticism in Germany and in England till about 1815. Before that date only the sensational aspects appealed to the English public, nurtured by the strong stuff of *The Castle of Otranto* etc. More stress might have been laid on the fact that Germany returned what England had provided, so that early German romanticism is English. And that the nature-poetry of Thomson, Collins and Gray should be labelled "an unpromising dawn of a new era" seems unwarranted. Klopstock is adduced as an example of new tendencies in that he replaced classical names by Teutonic ones: the same may be said of Gray, who substituted Hampden, Cromwell and Milton for their Roman predecessors.

The first wave of German romanticism reached England in 1779, when the translation of Goethe's *Werther* (via the French) took the public by storm and enjoyed a long popularity as novel, play and poem, because its

sentiment chimed in with the prevailing mode of feeling in this country, where Kelly and Cumberland, Sterne and Mackenzie had already created a congenial atmosphere. A new impulse came from Scotland when in 1788 Henry Mackenzie read his paper before the Royal Society in Edinburgh, entitled: An Account of the German Theatre, in which he could but accord scant praise to *Minna von Barnhelm*, *Emilia Galotti* and *Götz von Berlichingen*. Schiller's *Die Räuber* (called *Les Voleurs* in a compilation of German plays in a French translation: *Le nouveau Théâtre allemand*) is 'a wonderful drama', written in a language "in the highest degree eloquent, impassioned and sublime". It was often translated and was popular among the intellectuals. The German interest was on the wing. we find a German class in Edinburgh, Scott being one of the members; periodicals as the German Museum, the Analytical Review publish accounts of German books and translate extracts from Kotzebue, Bürger, Schiller and Goethe. In the decade 1790-1800 people went mad over Kotzebue; for the year 1799 we find 27 translations or adaptations; even Sheridan contributed and wrote *Pizarro* (based on *Die Spanier in Peru*), which was received with great enthusiasm. Of the propagandists especially William Taylor of Norwich should be mentioned. He was the first to praise Bürger and his *Ellenore* (in 1801 reprinted in Lewis's *Tales of Wonder*) stimulated Scott and several others to attempt a translation. In 1799 Scott published his translation of *Götz* (not evincing accurate knowledge of German), which play took his fancy on account of his own historical interest, and Mr. Stokoe is inclined to believe in its influence on Scott's literary products.¹⁾ His imitations of the diablerie-poems were simply a tribute to the prevailing taste. Personally I venture to add that his enthusiasm always bears the stamp of half-heartedness, for which opinion I refer to his *Essay on the Supernatural in Fictitious Composition*.

Neither should Lewis be taken too seriously. When he was at Weimar he wrote home: "Among other people to whom I have been introduced, are ... and M. de Goethe, the celebrated author of Werther; so that you must not be surprised, if I should shoot myself one of these fine mornings. As to my own nonsense, I write and write ..." ²⁾ That he was not altogether without critical insight may appear from his admiration of Schiller's *Kabale und Liebe* (his translation: *The Minister*) and Goethe's *Faust* which he discussed with Mme de Staël and translated for Byron. Besides, he himself confessed that, though suggested by *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, *The Monk* was not the result of any literary inspiration, but written because he was bored to death at the Hague. Two years later he called it "a trifling romance, written by a youth of twenty". ³⁾ Also Byron's attack on "wonder-working Lewis" in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers*, in 1809, was unnecessary, since already in the *Tales of Terror* (1799) the latter had published his parody: *Mudking or Smedley's Ghost*, followed by *Giles Jollup the Brave and Brown Sally Green* (a parody of his own *Alonzo the Brave and Fair Imogen* in *The Monk*) in the *Tales of Wonder* (1801), which also contained the humorous ballad from his own pen: *The Sailor's Tale*, as well as *The Cinder-King* (Anon.) and *The Maid on the Moor* by G. Colman. ³⁾

In a commendably short passage the author then refutes the statement made by Margraff and Zeiger, that Southey should have been a prominent instance

¹⁾ See also: J. Koch, Sir W. Scott's Beziehungen zu Deutschland I. Germ.-Rom. Monatschrift V—1, 2.

²⁾ The Life and Correspondence of M. G. Lewis, 1839.

³⁾ Cf. C. Thürrau, Die Geister in der englischen Literatur des 18 Jahrhunderts. Palaestra LV, Mayer und Müller. Berlin, 1906.

of German influence on English letters. The failure of the Pantisocracy-scheme and its consequences, told twice (pp. 91 and 96) is irrelevant to the subject in hand, as are so many more biographical details. In a lengthy commentary especially Brandl's allegations with respect to *Lenore's* influence on: *The Ode to the Departing Year*, *The Ballad of the Dark Ladie*, *The Ancient Mariner*, *Kubla Khan*, *Lewti* and *Christabel* are successfully disposed of.¹⁾ There is qualified praise for Coleridge's translation of *Die Piccolomini* and *Wallenstein's Tod*, which were coldly received. Goethe he could not appreciate highly, though he praised his lyrics and recognized novelty of thinking and imagining in *Faust*. So that, after all, the direct literary influence of German literature was small enough in his case. Though Mr. Stokoe acknowledges "a constant admiration for Kant", he fails to show the results; even if Coleridge's philosophy was a medley, it was German in origin and coloured all his later works and subsequently stamped its impress on later generations.²⁾

With respect to Wordsworth the author is soon ready: there are traces of *Die Räuber* in *The Borderers* and in other poems a few insignificant borrowings.

Shelley read *Faust* in 1815 and henceforth translations and references are forthcoming in great numbers, and though he made mistakes, he understood its spiritual meaning and his enthusiasm shows that now a better critical standard is applied than 15 years before, when in a preface to one of Kotzebue's plays (English translation) the author is placed on the same level as Schiller, Iffland, Beck, Schröder, Wieland, Goethe and Klopstock.³⁾ This better insight was in no small degree due to Mme de Staël's *De l'Allemagne*, which was known to Shelley as well as to Byron, another admirer of Goethe. Byron knew Gessner and Schiller. In 1816 he made the acquaintance of *Faust I* through Lewis; in 1817 *Manfred* appeared and immediately he was accused of plagiarism; he himself indignantly resented any alleged influence. Mr. Stokoe, in a short commentary, acknowledges some superficial resemblances and then, rather cavalierly, dismisses the idea of plagiarism. It is surprising to find that he has overlooked the splendid article by Helene Richter in *Englische Studien*, 51: Zum hundertsten jahrestage der veröffentlichung des Manfred. It is only fair to say that H. Richter is of the same opinion. More of *Faust* is to be traced in *Cain* and in *The Deformed Transformed*.

Appended to the book is an exhaustive list of translations, adaptations and imitations from the German with parodies etc., all published between 1789 and 1805, followed by an even longer bibliography, which might be supplemented with:

- G. Herzfeld, William Taylor von Norwich. Halle. Niemeyer. 1897.
- W. MacIntosh, Scott and Goethe. Galashiels. A. Walker. n.d.
- M. G. Lewis, The Monk. Brentano's Ltd. 1924.
- O. Hofmann, Studien zum englischen Schauerroman. Diss. Leipzig. 1915.
- M. Eimer, Zu Shelley's Dichtung. The Wandering Jew, Anglia 38, 3-4.
- M. Eimer, Einflüsse deutscher Räuber- und Schauerromantik auf Shelley, Mrs. Shelley und Byron. Englische Studien 48, 2.

Rotterdam.

W. A. OVAA.

¹⁾ Yet see for other poems: O. Ritter, Coleridgiana, Englische Studien 58, 3.

²⁾ Cf. H. Walker, The Literature of the Victorian Era, Introduction Chapt. II, and O. Elton, A Survey of English Literature 1780-1830, Chapt. XVI.

³⁾ Cf. J. M. Carré, Goethe en Angleterre IX ff.

The Road to Xanadu. A Study in the Ways of the Imagination, by JOHN LIVINGSTON LOWES. London, Constable, [1927], pp. xviii + 639, with 16 plates. 31/6 net.

A complaint is often heard against reviewers to the effect that most of them, after having politely bowed to the author of a book, start off on a short essay of their own, as if they were not so much concerned with the author to be reviewed, as with the little scraps of information they happen to have collected on the same (or on a cognate) subject. It is extremely unlikely that such a chance may be given to a reviewer of Prof. Lowes's book. There is not a jot of pertinent illustration left out of it; while, on the other hand, there is no trace of that superfluity which is so frequent in the case of books dealing with an enormous amount of material. There is not a single note (and the notes take a hundred and fifty closely printed pages) which does not contribute some useful detail, or — what is really remarkable — does not reward the curious reader with a stir of fresh interest. Were it not for the fear of bestowing an inhuman attribute on Prof. Lowes, and of diminishing the flow of sympathy which his personality awakens in the reader, I would almost say that he is infallible. Should a learned reader happen to surmise an omission, let him wait to proclaim it, and read the book more carefully: the omission will prove to be on his part, and not on that of Prof. Lowes. Nobody will contest the authority of Prof. E. Legouis. In his review of this book in the *Revue Anglo-Américaine* for February 1928 he regrets that Prof. Lowes has not founded his researches on the first edition of *The Ancient Mariner* (1798), or that, at least, he has not established a difference between the text of that edition and that of the following ones. But in the Notes, on p. 475, Prof. Lowes has stated:

In my own quotations from the poem I have used, as a rule, the final version of the text. . . . And whenever the text which is followed differs in any significant way from the earlier versions, the variants are. . . . given in the Notes. It is immaterial for my purpose at what stage in the composition of the poem the reminiscences which we are tracing came to the surface except so far as the possible lapse of time between the reading and the recollection may constitute a factor in the problem.

As a matter of fact, Prof. Lowes has constantly had before his eyes the earlier versions, and has quoted them, whenever it was expedient, as one may see from pp. 129, 149, 253, 261, 504, 508-9.

The under-title of the work, "A Study in the Ways of the Imagination", could hardly have been more felicitous. Though the sources of *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* have been traced by Prof. Lowes, so far as it was possible to human ingenuity (and he seems really to have moved farther afield the confines of human possibilities), a mere study of sources the book most emphatically is not. Or, if you like, it is an instance of the only way in which a study of the sources proves a useful, nay, a necessary instrument for critical appreciation. One may compare Prof. Lowes's book with another masterpiece of its kind, Prof. P. Rajna's famous study of the sources of *Orlando Furioso* (1876), to realize the immense progress accomplished in the field of *Quellenforschung*. A progress of which Prof. Lowes — I venture to say — is the chief, if not the sole begetter. Many years dedicated to the study of influences on Chaucer have so much refined the technique of *Quellenforschung* in the hands of Prof. Lowes, that he has finally been able, with the present work, to give rank and state second to no other to that (often rightly) despised handmaid of literary criticism.

I have said that this book was not to be about Coleridge himself — *sounds the conclusion*. — So in my ignorance I thought when I began to write. But now I know that the figure of Coleridge has been a living presence all the way.

I think Prof. Lowes is understating the results of his study, since no other book on Coleridge published to this date brings the reader into a closer intimacy with the workings of Coleridge's mind, that is with that part of Coleridge with which literary history is concerned. After the book of the American scholar, the only thing left is to read the poems themselves, since nothing more can humanly be done to appreciate in all their subtlest shades the aspects of Coleridge's genius. Prof. Lowes repeatedly calls attention to the limits of his research, lest a hasty reader may nourish the least suspicion of his belonging to the self-sufficient crowd of source-hunters:

That, I suspect, is one of the most momentous functions of the imagination — its sublimation of brute fact. Yet without a knowledge of the crass materials, the profoundly significant process is unintelligible. (p. 48). The facts are forgotten, and the poem stays. But the power that wrought the facts into the fabric of a vision outlasts both. And if we are rifling the urns where the dead bones of fact have long quietly rested, it is because the unquenchable spirit which gives beauty for ashes is there not wholly past finding out. (p. 241).

In the ordinary kind of literary criticism, what usually happens is that the work of art is presented to us isolated from its native sod, and curiously tinged with the new atmosphere of the critical hothouse to which it has been transferred for the moment. What ultimately is offered to us is not unlike "a dream remembered in a dream", to use a line of Coleridge. The critical medium is not infrequently so obtrusive, as to give us a thing arbitrarily alien to its real import. In a word, too often a purely literary critic is an *artifex artificii additus*. But if literary criticism can ever claim to be a science in the proper sense, the name of Prof. Lowes will remain as that of one of the founders of that science. Instead of submitting the work of art to the agency of an alien atmosphere, he conjures up round it all the elements among which it took shape. Not only the bookish *milieu* of sources, but also the live environment of sympathetic influences, as is shown in the masterly pages on the brotherhood of poets at Nether Stowey (chapters XI and XII).

If, then, I have made it clear that the rich suggestiveness of a masterpiece of the imagination springs in some measure from the fact that infinitely more than reached expression lay behind it in the shaping brain, so that every detail is saturated and irradiated with the secret influence of those thronged precincts of the unexpressed — if I have made that clear, my purpose is attained. I am not forgetting beauty. It is because the worth of beauty is transcendent that the subtle ways of the power that achieves it are transcendently worth searching out. (p. 240).

In a word, *The Road to Xanadu* is primarily a great lesson in method. In this sense, that road leads much farther than to the Coleridgean Paradise. Because I do not, with Prof. Legouis, believe that "ce cas presque unique . . . ne permet guère de généraliser". What, on the contrary, seems to me firmly established by Prof. Lowes's study, is that Coleridge offers to us a magnificently documented instance of the ways in which human imagination works at large. J. M. Robertson's often repeated opinion (in *New Essays towards a Critical Method*, 1897, p. 187) that Coleridge's poetry is "an abnormal product of an abnormal nature under abnormal conditions" has been conclusively proved inaccurate by Prof. Lowes. Authors generally read much less than Coleridge, and build more with the *données* of their immediate experience; and probably no other author has left such a record of his

readings as Coleridge in the so-called "Gutch Memorandum Book"; but, given the same wealth of documentation as is available in the case of Coleridge, the method of Prof. Lowes could be applied to the study of any other writer.

It is entirely beyond the scope of my notice to give illustrations from Prof. Lowes's book. Everything is there so closely knit together that, unless I were allowed to reproduce whole pages, I would not presume to do justice to Prof. Lowes's profound analysis. Pages 40-1, 177-78, 181, and scores of others could be indicated as well representative of the method. A few passages in which the difference between *The Ancient Mariner* and *Kubla Khan* is stressed may be quoted here, as summing up one of the most remarkable results of this study:

In *Kubla Khan* . . . the sole factor that determined the form and sequence which the dissolving phantasmagoria assumed, was the subtle potency of the associative links. There was this time no intervention of a waking intelligence intent upon a plan, to obliterate or blur them We have only to recall those passages in *The Ancient Mariner* in which the formative associations have been traceable, to recognize that their operations were essentially the same The subliminal blendings and fusings from which springs the insubstantial architecture of the dream are also latent beneath the complex workings of design. And that is no less essential to our understanding of the creative process than the further fact that in the one case the 'streamy' associations are unruddered, whereas in the other they are masterfully curbed. (pp. 401-02.)

Coleridge's case is unique in so far as he enables us to look into two different stages of the same process: the stage in which we watch the self-evolving flow of associations, in *Kubla Khan*, and the stage in which the self-evolving flow is curbed by "a conscious will intent upon the execution of a complex structural design" (p. 412). But what about the *form* of *Kubla Khan*?

On Coleridge's explicit testimony the images of the dream clothed themselves spontaneously with words. Such music is difficult, if not impossible, to think as divorced from conscious art — and all that we have so far learned bears out the tale that Coleridge told of the unconscious composition of the poem. (pp. 598-99.)

Prof. Lowes offers a very convincing solution of the seeming inconsistency:

During the months which just preceded *Kubla Khan*, Coleridge had been steadily mastering, in his versification, a new and extraordinary technique Now any technique acquired through the conscious expenditure of time and labour becomes in large degree, as everyone knows, unconscious in its exercise. When, then, images like those upon whose rhythmical expression Coleridge had expended infinite time and pains poured suddenly up in the unconsciousness of sleep, is it incredible that a craftsmanship which had itself become through rigorous discipline more than half unconscious, should respond, in a glorious *tour de force*, to a familiar stimulus?

A few words about the relation of Prof. Lowes's method to psycho-analysis will not be superfluous here, in order to stress the difference between perfectly sound and scientific work, and wild speculations of the kind of Robert Graves's, whose extravagant interpretation of *Kubla Khan* (in *The Meaning of Dreams*, London, 1924) is exposed by Prof. Lowes (p. 593ff.) with a moderation which we feel more capable of admiring than of imitating:

I wish to state with emphasis that I am dealing in this study with what psychoanalysts call the material content of the dream, and with that alone. With its so-called latent content — its possible symbolism of wish-fulfilment or conflict or what not — I have nothing whatever to do.

Brief Mentions.

A Grammar of Late Modern English. By H. POUTSMA. Part I: The Sentence. First Half: The Elements of the Sentence. Second Edition. Pp. XI + 540. Groningen, Noordhoff, 1928. Price f 9.00.

Since the completion of his monumental *Grammar* in 1926, Mr. Poutsma has allowed himself no rest. A new edition of the first half of Part I has just appeared, which is so far from being a mere reprint of its predecessor that, as regards length, it exceeds the latter by nearly two hundred pages. Its value as a grammatical reference-work will be enhanced accordingly.

Mr. Poutsma accurately characterizes his book as 'mainly descriptive, that is to say, its chief purpose is to register actual usages of speech.' It owes its merits to 'the fact that it comments systematically on the problems with which also Modern English abounds, and which have to be solved independently of the help of Old- or Middle English.' At the recent Linguistic Congress one heard a great deal of the synchronic, i.e. a-historic study of language, advocated by the Geneva school of linguistics, as opposed to the diachronic, i.e. historical method of investigation. It may be useful to point out that the Dutch school of Anglistics had carried out the synchronic method in practice before the representatives of international linguistics formulated the theory.

We intend to revert to the book on the publication of the second half, which is announced for the end of the current year, or the early part of 1929. Meanwhile, we express the cordial wish that the veteran scholar will be given strength to see the revision of his whole work completed. — R. W. Z.

Machiavelli and the Elizabethans. By MARIO PRAZ. Annual Italian Lecture of the British Academy 1928. Pp. 51. From the Proceedings of the British Academy. Volume XIII. London, Milford. Price 3s. net.

In this lecture, read 21 March 1928, Dr. Praz deals with the popular legend of Machiavelli, the wicked politician, as it originated in France and chiefly, but not solely, owing to Gentillet's *Contre-Machiavel*, spread to England. He shows that, as far as the stage was concerned, the Machiavellian principles, distorted as they had been, came to be uttered through the medium of Senecan drama. 'Seneca was at the back of every Tudor mind much more than Machiavelli, and sometimes what may be construed as Machiavellism is merely Senecan.' Besides, very few dramatists had a first-hand knowledge of Machiavelli's writings, and most of the time the villainous traits in the characters of their dramas were borrowed from Kyd and Marlowe, or at the utmost, from Gentillet.

Dr. Praz also points out that in the Elizabethan mind Machiavelli was often associated with Aretino and Loyola, strange as this may seem to us now. This is illustrated by interesting extracts from Donne's *Ignatius his Conclave* and Middleton's political play *A Game at Chess*. Machiavellism, refined by the study of the French *Encyclopédistes*, eventually became one of the ingredients of German Romanticism, in such figures as Schiller's Franz Moor, Tieck's Andrea Cosimo and Goethe's Mephistopheles. — R. W. Z.

The Post-adjectival Passive Infinitive.

1. The post-adjectival passive infinitive, found in sentences like *You are not fit to be seen*; *The proposal is worthy to be considered*; *It is hard to be borne*, seems at one time to have been more usual than it is in present-day English. Poutsma has rendered a discussion of modern usage superfluous; see Chapter LV of his *Grammar*, particularly § 80 ff. The only thing he has left for others to do is to trace the origin and development of the construction.

In my short paper on the predicative passive infinitive in *English Studies* X, 107 ff. I purposely did not refer to the post-adjectival passive infinitive, when I enumerated the various cases in which the passive infinitive is found in early Middle English, first because the post-adjectival passive infinitive can hardly be considered a regular early Middle English construction, and secondly because I intended to make it the subject of a special enquiry.

2. In Old English, as in the other Germanic languages, an adjective is frequently followed by an infinitive, which is generally inflected. According to Callaway, *The Infinitive in Anglo-Saxon*, p. 150, the uninflected infinitive is found only six times in this construction. "Of the 26 examples of the infinitive in Anglo-Saxon poetry, only two are uninflected; of the 221 examples in the prose only four are uninflected" (l. c., p. 158). In Chapter XVI, xi, dealing with the origin of the construction, Callaway arrives at the following conclusion: "Most probably, therefore, the infinitive, uninflected and inflected, with adjectives is an idiom native to the Germanic languages" (l. c., p. 257).

3. In many cases the infinitive after an adjective is undoubtedly active, both in form and meaning. There are, however, cases in which such infinitives may have had a passive sense. The question is discussed by Callaway, l. c., p. 149. He says: "To me the active infinitive with adjectives seems almost, if not quite, exclusively active in sense". On the same page he quotes *Orosius* 80.11 f., *Swa ðeah seo . . . menegeo ðæs folces wæs ða iedre to oferwinnanne* *donne heo us sie nu to gerimanne oððe to geliefanne* (... *cujus numerum nunc difficilius est adstrui, quam tunc fuit vinci*), and *Past. C.* 459.3, *sio hea lar is betere manegum monnum to helanne*, and *feawum to secgganne* (*Alta enim quæque debent multis audientibus contegi, et vix paucis aperiri*). Callaway concludes his argumentation as follows: "However, despite the presence of the Latin passive infinitives in these sentences, I see no necessity for considering the corresponding infinitives in Anglo-Saxon as passive; it seems to me that the utmost that we can say is this: the infinitives may be passive in sense, but are probably not."

The author might also have called special attention to the following instances, which he quotes on p. 134: *Boethius* 92.24 *ða stanas . . . beoð earfode to todælenne* (*ne facile dissoluantur*), and *Past. C.* 409.20, *sæde ðæt he uniede wære to gehealdenne* (*difficile capitur*).

4. I cannot endorse Callaway's views unreservedly.

The infinitive, uninflected or inflected, was originally neutral as regards voice; a sentence like '*Hit is iepe to donne*' meant something like 'It is easy as regards doing.' In Old English, however, the inflected infinitive had in several cases given up its neutral character.

If we compare *Past. C.* 355.21, '*hit bið swiðe uniede ægðer to donne*' with *Past. C.* 409.20, '*he sæde . . . ðæt he (= se cræft) uniede wære to*

gehealdenne', we cannot fail to see a difference. In the first sentence *to donne* has an object (*ægðer*), and must, therefore, be active in sense. Although *hit*, indicating something indefinite, as in Modern English *It is foggy*, was originally the subject, and *ægðer to donne*, 'as regards doing both', was an adverbial adjunct to *uniede*, in Old English *ægðer to donne* was the logical subject of the sentence, *hit* being merely the provisional subject. A similar analysis is impossible in the case of the second quotation from the *Pastoral Care*. Here *he*, which means something definite, *se cræft*, is, and always was, both the logical and the grammatical subject, while *to gehealdenne*, 'as regards keeping', has continued to be an adverbial adjunct to *uniede*. It seems impossible to me to interpret this adjunct intelligibly, unless we assume that in Old-English it had come to mean 'as regards being kept'.

Callaway, in commenting upon certain examples given by Farrar, *The Gerund in Old English*, says, "Undoubtedly each of these infinitives may be translated as if passive, but I see no necessity therefor in either sentence" (l. c. p. 149). It is not so much a question of translating as of interpreting, and in spite of Callaway's arguments to the contrary, I hold the opinion that a good many post-adjectival inflected infinitives in Old English cannot be interpreted rationally, unless it is postulated that they are passive in sense.

In the following examples, several of which have been taken from Callaway's book, Ch. XI, I consider the infinitives to have a passive meaning.

Boethius, 16.11 ff., [Pync]að þe nu swiðe diore and swiðe le[o]fe ða ðing ða ðe nawðer ne sint ne getrewe to habbanne, ne eac iede to forlætanne?

Ibid. 81.2 f., Swa eac nu eorðe and wæter sint swiðe earfoðe to geseonne oððe to ongitonne dysgū monnū on fyre.

Ibid. 92.27 f., hi (= þæt wæter and sio lyft) [b]ioð swiðe eðe to tedælenne (sic).

Greg. Dial. 230.14 ff., he onbead be him Pa bebodu, þe wyrðelice wæron to gehyranne.

Ælfric, *Hom.* II, 542, Ælc ehtnys bið earfoðe to ðolienne.

Id., *Pref. Gen.* (Crawford), 77.42, seo boc is swiþe deop gastlice to understandenne.

Rule St. Ben. 67.1, þæt gastlice angyt is earfoðe to understandende buton haligra manna teahunge (*Winteneý: gearfoðe to understandenne.*)

Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem 21 f., æghwylc Para is wyrðe synderlice in gemyndum to habbanne.

Ibid. 29 ff., Pa þing eall þæm monnum þe hit geseoð and sceawigað wæron uneþe to gewitenne.

Ibid. 65 ff., þy læs þæt eow seo sægen monifealdlicor bi þon þuhte to writanne, ic

Ibid. 75 f., ic wolde þæt þu þa ðing ongeate þa þe weorðe sindor in gemyndum to habbanne.

Ibid. 189 f., Pa ic þæt wæter bergde, ða wæs hit bitterre and grimre to drincanne þonne ic æfre ænig oðer bergde.

5. Callaway states, l. c. p. 158 that he has found only one instance of a passive infinitive after an adjective, namely

Ælfric, *Hom.* II, 316, we ðe næron wurde beon his wealas gecigde.

This example is highly interesting, because *worth(y)* is the only adjective that is frequently accompanied by a passive infinitive from early Middle English onwards. The plain passive infinitive, however, is decidedly exceptional in this case. The following early instance is of doubtful value:

Sawles Warde, O.E.H. I., p. 275, hire durewart þe of feor bihalde alle þe cuminde, hwuch be wurde inzong to habben; oðer beon bisteken Prute.

The preposition *to* preceding *habben* may also belong to *beon*. The *O. E. D.* quotes two instances of *worthy* followed by a plain passive infinitive, one from the *Cursor Mundi*, and one from the 26 *Political Poems*. There is another in

Piers Pl., B, V, 236, Dow haddest [be] better *worthy be hanged* perfore.

Pecock employs the construction *worth[y]* + plain passive infinitive fairly frequently.

Repressor, p. 98, thiik opinion is not *worthi be holde* trewe; cf. not *worthi to be holde* trewe on the same page.

Ibid. p. 484, the IIIJ ordris or religiouns or beggeris ben badde and not gode, neither *worth be had* and *vsid* in the chirche.

Further instances are found *Ibid.*, pp. 214, 347, 361, 371, 435, 456, 469, 471.

There is no instance of *worth* + plain passive infinitive in the *O. E. D.*

6. The unique *O. E.* example quoted above, taken by itself, hardly justifies the conclusion that *Ælfric* distinctly felt that the inflected infinitive usually found after *weorþe* (*wurðe* etc.) — see the examples in section 4 — was passive in sense, and could, therefore, be replaced by a passive infinitive. If, however, we view this Old English unicum in connection with the fact, that quite a number of instances in which *worth(y)* is followed by a passive infinitive, can be collected from early Middle English texts, it assumes a different aspect. *Ælfric* in employing a passive infinitive — even though it is not preceded by *to* — initiated a new construction, which soon lost the character of a novelty, and has remained in use until the present day.

The following quotations afford ample proof that the construction under discussion was already frequently used in the first half of the thirteenth century.

Orm, *Dedication* 127, He shall onn ende *wurpþi* ben þurh Godd to *wurpenn* *borrhenn*. Id. *Hom.* 2287 ff., forþi wass zho *wurpþ* full wel Utnumennli3 to *wurpenn* þurh Drihhtin *blettcedd*; 2357 f., þærþurh wass zho wel *wurpþ to ben* swa *wurpþedd* her onn erþe; 6086 ff., uss wass . . . tacnedd Patt mann shall ben *wurpþi to ben* þurh Cristess name *borrzenn*; 11072 ff., 3iff twelfte daz3 iss *wurpþ To beon* *wurþlike freollsedd*; Itt iss wel *wurpþ la* fullwiss *To beon* *wurþlike freollsedd*; 13994 f., Da shallt tu ben *wurpþi* þurh himm All swa to *wurpenn* *borrhenn*; 17066 f., Off swille & swille wass Nicodem Wel *wurpþ to wurpenn læredd*.

Wohunge of ure Lauerd, *O. E. H.* I, p. 271, Hwa for largesce is betere *wurð to beo luued* þen þu mi luue lif. *Ibid.*, p. 285, nis nan swa *wurði to beo luued* as tu swete ihesu.

St. Katherine, 506 ff., schaw sumhwet of ham, for hwi ha beon *wurðe for to beon iwurðet*.

St. Marherete, I, 22, Pat were *wurðe for to beon iwurget*.

Ancr. R., p. 38, ich nam *wurðe for to beon ibliscd* in hore ueolauredden.

Gen. and Exod., 1012, ðe was *wurði wurded to ben*; *Ibid.* 3752 f., he weren *wurði* bet to ðat seruise to ben set.

In adducing further *M. E.* examples I will observe the utmost brevity.

S. Eng. Leg. 169.2193, nouzt *wurþe to beon i-bured*.

Rob. of Glouc. Chron. (Rolls), 8977, *wurþe to be icluped*.

Rob. of Brunne, Handl. S. 349, 2161, 2641, 4814, 10279, *wurþy to be shent*; 5516, *wurþy vaunsed to be*; 5849 f., *wurþy For to be wursched*.

Kyng Alis. 1723, *worthy to be hongid*.

Prose Ps. XLVII. 1, *worthi to be praysed*.

Earl of Toul, Selection in Emerson, *M. E. R.*, 111.23, *worthy to be brente*.

Wycl. Sel. Wks., II, 69 (twice) and 72, *worþi . . . to be clepid*; II, 74, *unworþi to be taken*; II, 75, *unworþi to be helpid*.

Purvey, *Ps.* XLVII, 1; XCV, 4; CXII, 3; CXLIV, 3, *worthi to be preisid*; *Luke* XV, 19 and 21; 1 *Cor.* XV, 9, *worthi to be clepid*; *Gal.* II, 11, *worthi to be vndirnommen*.

Chaucer, *Boeth.* IV, pr. IV, 516 ff., *worthy to be hated*; *worthy nat to ben hated*, but *for to ben had* in pite; *Cant. T.*, A 2794, *worthy to ben loved*.

Gower, *Conf. Am.* I, 107, *Worth To be beloved*.

Rom. Rose 7104, *worth to bene brent*.

Apol. Lollards, p. 8, *not worþi to be rehersed*.

Lant. of Lizt 14.24, *worþi to be holden*; 68.8, *worþe to be schent*.

Towneley Pl. 29.200, *worthi to be cled*.

Pall. on Husb. 162.116, *worthi to be born*.

Generydes 2168, *worthy for to [be] had* in mynd.

Prose Life Alex. 100.14, *worthy to be praysede*.

Bokenam, Leg. 115.522, *to be drede & wursheped most wurthy*; 115.535 f., *most wurthy To be prechyd & preysyd*.

Alphab. of Tales, 155, *wurthi to be smeten off*.

Pecock, Donet, 15.16 *worþi to be doon*; 141.21, *worþi to be trowid and holde*; 167.7, *not . . . worþi to been writun, tauzt and leerned*; 167.11 *not worþ to be writun, leerned or seen*.

Id., *Repr.* p. 4, *worþi to be blamed*; p. 48, *worthi to be take for trewe*; p. 65, *worthi or not worthi to be spoken or writun*, etc.; I have noted more than twenty instances.

Gesta Rom. p. 31, *worthi to be presentid*; p. 129, *worthi to be dampnid*.

Past. L., No. 144, *worthy to be indyted*.

Coventry Leet B. p. 289, *worthy to be blamed*.

It is unnecessary to give further instances, although many later ones might be cited.

In Middle English *worth* and *worthy* mean the same in connection with a passive infinitive. *Pecock* still uses them interchangeably, although, judging from the above examples, *worthy* seems always to have been the more usual one of the two adjectives in the construction in question; *worth* became obsolete in this idiom about the end of the Middle English period.

7. As has been observed, the construction instanced in the preceding section is remarkable on account of its early appearance. It is also remarkable on account of its having entirely supplanted the older construction. I cannot give a single early Middle English instance of *worth[y]* followed by a 'gerundial' infinitive, active in form, but passive in sense. In texts dating from the latter part of the thirteenth century until Chaucer's time I have, however, met with a few examples.

a. 1300 *North Engl. Leg.* 10.485, he was *wurthi to prais*.

a. 1300 *Cursor Mundi* 4056 C, Ioseph he sagh a night in sueuen þe quilk es *wurthi forto neuen*. The other MSS. have the same reading.

c. 1300 *Lay F. Mass B.*, B 72 f., In worde, & werk I am to wite and *worth to blame*; C 45 and E 73 read *worthy for to blame*; F 51 has *wurthi I am to blame*.

1303 *Rob. of Brunne, Handl. Synne* 2165 f., Pou art a-cursed And *hange were wurþy* on a peyl; MS. D reads *wurþi to hangen vp*; 4869, Pys chylde was *wurþy for to blame*; 11104, he to *wurschep ne es wurþy*; MS. O reads *to be wrshepede*.

1383-4 Chaucer, *House of F.* 707 f., that I can preve By resoun *worthy for to leve* (= believe).

8. It is perhaps worth noting that *worthy* followed by a gerund is, as might be expected, a construction of considerably later origin than *worthy* + passive infinitive. The earliest example cited in the *O. E. D.* i. v. *worthy* 8. c, is dated c. 1440. There is, however, an instance about a century older in *Hampole's Form of Living, Yorkshire Writers I*, p. 8, Ho what it es mykell, to be *wurthi louyng* (in both MSS. printed there).

Worth with a gerund seems to be of comparatively recent origin. No examples have been found in M.E. so far. The earliest quotation given in the *O. E. D.* i. v. *worth*, 8, b, b, is from Spenser's *Colin Clout* (1591-5). The following instance is slightly earlier: Ellis, *Orig. Letters* II, III, CCXVI, p. 89, For any other thinges here hapenyng there are none *worthe wryting* of (date 1582).

9. Although only one instance of *worth* with a passive infinitive has been found in late Old English, the frequency of the construction from about 1200 onwards justifies the conclusion that it became a usual idiom in the intervening two centuries. As in other cases the post-adjectival passive infinitive is not found until much later, the early occurrence of the passive infinitive with *worth(y)* must be owing to some special factor. What this factor was is a question that must be left unanswered for the present. If there were synonymous constructions in which the passive infinitive was used, it might be possible to find some explanation, but unfortunately there are none. The fact that Bede twice employs a passive infinitive after *geearnian*, 'earn', 'merit' (Callaway. I. c., p. 71), might give us a clue, if the same construction was used with M.E. *ernen*; this, however, is not the case.

10. If we except its employment in connection with *worth[y]*, the post-adjectival passive infinitive is, as regards its first appearance, contemporary with the predicative passive infinitive. The first instances of it crop up towards the end of the fourteenth century, and examples are fairly frequent in fifteenth century English, though perhaps not quite so numerous as instances of the predicative passive infinitive. The introduction of the new construction must be owing to the same cause that brought the predicative passive infinitive into use, namely the tendency to establish agreement between function and form. With some adjectives, like *able*, in the sense of 'proper', 'fit', 'suitable', 'appropriate', *good (better)*, *necessary*, the passive infinitive is very usual; with many others it only occurs sporadically. Some past participles, like *due (dew)*, *aferd*, *woned (wont)* had already become distinctly adjectival in late Middle English, and can accordingly also be followed by a passive infinitive. As will be seen from the following examples this is particularly frequently the case with *woned (wont)*.

- 1377-81 Chaucer, *Boethius* II, pr. VI, 90 f., For contrarious thinges ne ben nat *wont to ben y-felawshipped* to-gidere; Id. *Ibid.* IV, pr. VI, 215, it hath ben *wont to be seyd*.
 Id. *Ibid.* III, pr. XII, 166, it is *unable to be unlaced*; Id. *Ibid.* IV, pr. VI, 171, a bond of causes nat *able to ben unbounde*.
 c. 1380 Wycl. *Select Wks.* I, 246, *feyn to be dischargid* of erþeli goodis.
 1388 Purvey, *Acts*, XXI. 13, Y am *redi*, not oonly *to be bounden*, but also to die. The same wording in Paues, *A Fourteenth-Century Biblical Version*.
 Id. *Hebr.* V, 11, a great word for to seie, and *able to be expowned*.
 Id., *James* III, 17, wisdom that is from aboue is *able to be counselid*.
 Id., *Peter* I, 5, eritage vncorruptible that is *redi to be schewid* in the last time. Paues: *redy to ben y-schewed*.
 c. 1400 Tryamour 364, The quene was *aferde to be schente*.
 c. 1400 Apology for the Lollards, p. 19, is it (= cursing) not *possible to be put of comyn* (= fellowship) of men.
 beg. 15 c. *Secreta Secretorum* 12.13, whan he saith a thing that is *good and profitable to be done*, lete him do it diligently. Id. *Ibid.* 27.25, In this tyme is *best to be lete blood*.
 Id. *Ibid.* 73.14, Perynne sholde men vsyn eyren, but noght ouer ij, *nesshe to be suppyd*.
 Prose Leg., *Anglia* VIII, 134, 28 f. figuratif spekynges Pat are not *lighte to be turnyd* in to englische langage.

- 1410-20 *Mandeville's Travels* 27.13, *Pat cytee of Baldak was wont to ben clepid Sutus*; 45.20, *wont to ben cleped*; 58.11 *wont to be clept*.
Ibid. 56.10 f., it was clept Bethel where the Arke of god with reliques of Lewes weren *wont to ben put*.
- c. 1425 *Conquest of Ireland*, Dub. MS. 66.7 f., that Cursed me[te] that four syth a yer was *wonet to be asked yn chyrche tounes*.
- c. 1440 *Conquest of Ireland*, Rawl. MS. 143.7, they be not *aferde ne ashamyd to be founde*.
- c. 1440 *Generydes* 1170, that were *god to be knowe*.
- c. 1440 *Gesta Rom.* p. 88, he come by a depe water, *Pat was impossible to be passid*.
- 1449 *Pecock, Repr.* p. 134, he is *vnable to be admitted and to be receyued* into eny enquirence or communance.
 Id. *Ibid.* p. 383, *mouable or vnmouable godis zouun and dew to be paied* (twice). Id. *Ibid.* 389, *dew to be zouun or paied*.
 Id. *Ibid.* p. 504, al that is notabili *better to be had than to be not had*; 'better to be had than to be not had' again on same page.
- 1443-9 Id. *Donet* 157.4, *summe ben good to be rehercid*.
- 1449 Id., *Repr.*, p. 350, it is not *like to be turned* into such disposicioun.
- 1443-9 Id., *Donet* 2.3, alle Pingis whiche were *necessarye to be knowen*; same expression *Ibid.* 1.5.
 Id. *Ibid.* 2.15 *forto zeue knowing of summe Pingis being ful necessarye to be leernyd*. Id. *Ibid.* 103.25 f., Which articles (scil. of the creed) ben as *necessary to be bileued* as *Vis* seid first article. *Ibid.* 167.1 f., *worpi and necessarye to be writun, tauzt and leerned*; cf. *Ibid.* 167.7, *not necessarye and worpi to ben writun, tauzt and leerned*.
- 1449 Id. *Repr.* p. 47, *necessarye forto be vnderstonde*; p. 130 *necessarye to be leerned*.
 Id. *Ibid.* p. 356, this is *ful sengil to be bileued*.
- 1443-9 Id. *Donet* 104.23 ff., *oonly Poo articles were suffieient to vs to be bileuid*.
- 1443-9 Id. *Donet* 89.4 f., *Pei* (scil. *gracis* or *powers*) weren *vnreouerable to be hadde, or to be geten, or aftirwarde to be kepte*.
- 1449 Id. *Repr.* p. 136, al such thing is *woned to be clepid leeful*; p. 153, *not woned to be doon coursli*; p. 389, *woned to be take*.¹⁾
- 1450 *Paston L.*, No. 105, I pray yow to comown wyth Brews and Paston . . . what were most *necessary to be desired*.
- c. 1460 *Transl. De Imit. Christi* 53.12 f., *Pat shal be take away fro Pe proude man Pat is wont to be yeven to the meke man*; 129.14 f., In *Pese* and many oþer like *Pe true seruauant of god is wont to be preued*.
Ibid. 94.30, Thou knowist what is *expedient to be zouen to euery body*.
Ibid. 137.23, *redy . . . to be mekely inclyned & bowed to euery creature* . . .
- 1481 *Caxton, Reynard*, p. 33, the place there as felons ben *wonte to be put to deth*.
- 1486 *Records London City Church*, p. 3, payment . . . at *iiij principall termes of the yere & in the Citee of london vsuell to be payd*.
- 1490-1 *Ibid.* p. 166, that house was *wonte to be lett for xiiij s iiij d*.
- late 15 c. *Courtesy Book* 54.14 f., And this visitacion shalbe doon ones in yere withoute it be *nedfull to be done* ofter.

In the following quotation *Pecock* employs the adjective *likely* with a passive infinitive attributively:

Repr. p. 350, neither eny sure trouble neither eny *likeli to be trowid trouthe* may be proued or knowun or trowid therbi.

¹⁾ It will have been noticed that *Pecock* shows a remarkable preference for passive infinitives, whenever they are logically correct. In my paper on the predicative passive infinitive I only gave a selection from the numerous examples found in the *Repressor*; I might have given upwards of sixty further instances from the same text. Besides there are at least thirty-one examples in the *Donet*. The reader may be interested to learn that I have noted sixteen instances of the pred. pass. inf. in the *Apology for the Lollards*, nine in the second version of *Secreta Secretorum*, three in the first version of the *Gesta Romanorum*, and no fewer than forty-five in the translation of *De Imitatione Christi* (date c. 1460). This corroborates my remark that further search would probably bring a good many more examples to light.

11. In section 1 of this paper the remark was made that at one time the post-adjectival passive infinitive seems to have been more usual than in present-day English.

In the following sixteenth-century quotations thirty-three adjectives are represented, nineteen of which only occur once. As no doubt much more material might be hunted up, it is not safe to draw any conclusions as to the relative frequency of the various adjectives with a passive infinitive. It is, however, evident that *easy*, *fit*, *good*, *hard*, *meet*, *necessary* (*needful*, *needless*), and *[im]possible* were pretty often used in this construction.

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| able | Nature II, 197 yt ys <i>able to be sold</i> .
Eden, <i>Newe India</i> (Arber), p. 16, the skinne of Rhinoceros being....
scarcely <i>able to be pearsed</i> with a dart. |
| apt | Lyly, <i>Euphues</i> , p. 183, is it straunge to see that burnt which is <i>apt to be burnt</i> ? Id. <i>Ibid.</i> , p. 295, I had rather be.... obstinate in mine owne conceipt.... then <i>apt to be wrought</i> to others constructions. |
| beautiful | Webbe, <i>Trauailes</i> (Arber), p. 25, Fowles called Pharses whose feathers are very <i>beautiful to be worne</i> . |
| content | Sidney, <i>Ap. for Poetrie</i> (Arber), p. 41, euen those harde harted euill men.... yet will be <i>content to be delighted</i> . |
| convenient | Ellis, <i>Orig. Letters</i> III, II, CLXXXIX, hit ys thought most <i>conuenient to be done</i> . |
| dangerous | Andrewes, <i>Noble lyfe</i> etc., Extr. in <i>Early Eng. Meals and Manners</i> , p. 119, it is very <i>daungerous to be eten</i> . |
| delicate | Eden, <i>Hystorie weste Indies</i> (Arber), p. 220, They are very <i>delicate to bee eaten</i> . |
| delicious | Andrewes, <i>Noble lyfe</i> etc., Extr. in <i>Early Eng. Meals and Manners</i> , p. 114, he (= the heringe) is very <i>delicious to be eten</i> . |
| delightsome | Webbe, <i>Discourse</i> (Arber), p. 29, Than are there two Hystoricall Poets, no lesse profitable then <i>delightsome to be read</i> . |
| easy | Elyot, <i>Gouernour</i> II, 40, it (= affabilitie) is in sondry wise, but moste proprely, where a man is facile or <i>easie to be spoken unto</i> .
Eden, <i>Decades</i> (Arber), p. 138, Yet are they.... <i>easie to be allured</i> to owre customes and religion. Id. <i>Hyst. weste Indies</i> (Arber), p. 228, They haue a rynde not very thycke, and <i>easy to bee broken</i> . <i>Ibid.</i> p. 230, they.... cut, it as yf it were a tender thyng and <i>easie to bee sawne</i> .
Robinson, <i>Transl. Utopia</i> (Arber), p. 32, nothyng is more <i>easie to be founde</i> . <i>Ibid.</i> p. 47, that.... is <i>easier to be founde</i> . <i>Ibid.</i> p. 79, These doores be.... so <i>easie to be opened</i> , that.... <i>Ibid.</i> p. 141, they be both <i>easy to be caried</i> .
Gosson, <i>Schoole of Ab.</i> (Arber), the Scholer.... was <i>easier to be drawn to vanitie</i> then to good gouernment.
Lyly, <i>Euphues</i> (Arber), p. 59, Diddest not thou accompt them <i>easie to be won</i> ? |
| excellent | Eden, <i>Hyst. weste Indies</i> (Arber), p. 225, the tortes are more <i>excellent to be eaten</i> withowt offence to the stomake. |
| fain | Latimer, <i>Seven Sermons</i> (Arber), p. 63, the regent of Fraunce was <i>faine to be sent for</i> . |
| fair | Lyly, <i>Euph.</i> p. 90, the Cedar tree, though it be <i>faire to be seene</i> |
| fit | Lyly, <i>Euph.</i> p. 183, is it straunge to see.... that melten, which is <i>fit to be melted</i> ?
Sidney, <i>Ap. for Poetrie</i> , p. 36, the vniuersall wayes (= weighs) what is <i>fit to be sayd or done</i> . Id., <i>Ibid.</i> p. 62, Yet had he great wants, <i>fitt to be forgien</i> .
<i>Presbyterian Movement</i> (Camden Soc.), p. 37, it was thought.... not now <i>fitt to be delt in</i> . Same expression again on p. 39. <i>Ibid.</i> p. 12, If anything do fall out in the meane time <i>fit to be consulted upon</i> , the moderator may call the Classis together.
<i>Leyc. Corr.</i> , p. 245, he had the truth of all, but not <i>fitt to be knowen</i> to many.
<i>Egerton Papers</i> , p. 124, the former.... is so defaced as noe way <i>fitt to be offered</i> unto the Queene. <i>Ibid.</i> p. 284, there may some sure ground be hadd to settle a more sownd resolution what were <i>fytt to be donne</i> . |

- good *Letters Rich. III and Henry VII*, p. 104, it is thought *good to be done* in the second and third meeting.
 Elyot, *Gouernour*, I, p. 269, it were moche *better to be occupied* in honest recreation than to do nothyng.
Letters Suppr. Monasteries, p. 160, I moste lowly beseche your grace that I may know your plesure whatte is *beste to be done*.
 Brinklow, *Compl.*, p. 68, it is *good to be vsed* of syngle persons.
 Eden, *Hyst. weste Indies*, p. 220, they are much *better to bee eaten*.
Ibid. p. 223, not *good to bee eaten*; p. 229 *good to bee eaten*. *Id.* *Moscouia and Cathay* p. 329, *good to bee eaten*.
 Googe, *Eglogs*, p. 25, doubting . . . what was *best to be done*.
 handsome Robinson, *Transl. Utopia*, p. 141, they be . . . *handsome to be moued*.
 hard Tynd. *Hebr.* V, 11, Wherof have we many thynges to saye which are *harde to be vttered*.
 Robinson, *Transl. Utopia*, p. 93, that is not *harde to be done*; *Ibid.* p. 128, This is *harde to be obserued* in other countreis.
 Lyly, *Euphues*, p. 150, I had rather he should be soone angry then *hard to be pleased*.
 Gosson, *Schoole of Ab.*, p. 23, these qualities [are] as *harde to bee wel vsed* . . . as they are *to be learned*.
 lawfull Tynd., *Luke VI*, 2, Why do ye that, which is not *lafulfull to be done* on the saboth dayes.
 material *Trevelyan Papers*, p. 136, The seid Thomas saith that . . . any other thing comprysed in the seid answer being *materyall to be replied unto* is trewe.
 meet *Letters Suppr. Monasteries*, p. 223, At Caversham ys a propre lodginge . . . *mete to be bestowyd* upon som frynde of your lordeships.
 Lyly, *Euphues*, p. 89, because I was content to be his friend, thought he me *meete to be made* his foole.
 Webbe, *Discourse*, p. 24, Aristotle . . . thought no worke so *meete to be reade vnto* a king, as the worke of Homer.
 Cooper, *Admonition*, p. 119, there were greater things . . . *meete to be altered* in a Church rightly reformed.
Journal Siege Rouen (Camden Misc. I), p. 24, The rest of this adventure is *mete to be told* in a friend's earre. *Ibid.* p. 50, herein I reserve somewhat . . . not *meete to be adventured* to paper.
 necessary *Letters Rich. III and Henry VII*, II, 103, letters be *necessary to be sent* unto them.
Laboryouse Journey Olv, Their ages are as *necessary to be knowne* as their doctrynes.
 Sidney, *Ap. for Poetrie*, p. 50, the rules chiefly *necessary to be borne away*, are compiled in verses.
 Sir John Smythe, *Lett. fr. Eminent Lit. Men*, p. 63, I have sett downe no matters . . . but that ar . . . verie *necessarie to be observed and established* in your Kingdome.
 needful Brinklow, *Compl.* p. 26, This mater is surely *nedeful to be loked vpon*; the same expression again on p. 41.
 Gosson, *Schoole of Ab.*, p. 53, I touch that which is *needefull to bee shewen*.
 needless *Narratives Reformation* (Camden Soc.), p. 31, the great and tedious travayle of one preacher now *needles to be named*.
 Sidney, *Ap. for Poetrie*, p. 43, leauing some as *needlesse to be remembered*, it shall not be amisse in a worde to cite the speciaall kindes.
 plain Sidney, *Ap. for Poetrie*, p. 22, . . . which in all Nations at this day wher learning florisheth not, is *plaine to be seene*.
 [im]possible Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, I, LXXII, p. 208, there shulde be no thing requyred bi hym *possible to be doone*.
 Boke of Keruyngge, p. 163, it (scil. the meat carved) were *possyble for to be Ioynd agayne* togyder.
 Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, I, LXVIII, p. 231, labour shuld be made for speciall confirmation . . . (whiche he ever reaputide in manner as *impossible to be gotten*.)
 Id., *Ibid.*, II, II, CXLV, p. 202, is yt *possible to be beleved*?
 Robinson, *Transl. Utopia*, p. 68, whyche I thinke is *not possible to be obserued*.
 Webbe, *Discourse*, p. 68, our wordes are . . . not *possible to bee framed* with any good grace after their vse.

- profitable Andrewe, *Noble lyfe* etc., Extr. in *Early Eng. Meals and Manners*, p. 113, here after followeth of the natures of the fisshes of the See whiche be right *profitable to be vnderstande*.
- propise Elyot, *Gouvernour*, II, p. 415, there shal neuer lacke men apte and *propise to be set in auctoritie*.
- ready *Trevelyan Papers*, p. 133, one James Cappys was seased of the seid londes & tenantes.... by just & lawfull conveyaunz in the law, *redy to be showed*.
Tynd., *Acts XXI*, 13, I am *redy not to be bound* only, but also to deye.
- ripe Ellis, *Orig. Letters*, II, III, CCXXV, Curcell's man.... is *ready to be employed* when I shall here from yor Honor.
- insufficient Latimer, *Sermon on the Ploughers*, p. 24, I feare me thys lande is not yet *rype to be ploughed*.
Trevelyan Papers, p. 132, the seyd bylle of complaynt is uncerteyn & *insufficient* in the law *to be aunsweryd unto*. The same expression is found again on p. 135 and p. 136.
- sweet Eden, *Muscovia and Cathay* (Arber), p. 329, They say that it is very *sweete to bee eaten*.
- tractable Lyly, *Euphues*, p. 158, It was with an Atheyst, a man in my opinion monstrous, yet *tractable to be perswaded*.
- wholesome Eden, *Hyst. weste Indies*, p. 231, This fyssche is.... *holsome to be eaten*.
Id. *Voyage rounde about the worlde*, p. 259, reedes as bygge as a mans legge, and full of cleare water *holsome to bee drunke*.

12. The question to what extent the passive and not the active infinitive is regularly used after an adjective in present-day English, is still unanswered. Investigation would probably show that in this special case, as in so many others, there is a considerable difference between colloquial and literary English. Poutsma, l. c. II, II, p. 460, section 85, says: "The active infinitive with passive meaning also stands rather frequently after *too* + predicative adjective". Still, it seems to me that most English people would say: 'It is too good to be believed'; 'The question is too difficult to be answered on the spur of the moment'; 'I don't like horse-play any longer, I am too old now to be mauled about.'

As appears from the following quotations, the passive infinitive was already used in this case in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century English.

- 1449 Pecock, *Repr.*, p. 40, which processe were *ouer long to be agen rehercid* here. The same expression is found on p. 144.
Id. *Ibid.* p. 152, whos textis or processis weren *ouerlong to be here writen and rehercid*.
- 1531 Elyot, *Gouvernour* I, p. 289, The particular kyndes of euery of them he describeth, whiche were *to longe here to be rehersed*.
- 1549 *Laborouse Journey*, G 3r, The nombre of good Latyne authors within thys realme were *to longe.... to be rehearsed*.
- 1586 Mary Queen of Scots, *Bardon Papers*, p. 33, For divers great and important considerations, wich weare here *to longe to be deduced*, I cannot but grateflic praise and commend your common desire....

There is at least one collocation in which only the passive infinitive is now used, namely *easy to be entreated* 'not unwilling to be prevailed upon'. The *O. E. D. i. v. easy*, 12, b, states: '*easy* in this sense is now only used with passive'. The idiom is not instanced, but an early example is given elsewhere, namely

- 1576 Fleming, *Panoplie Ep.*, 241, For he is a man full of affabilitie.... and *easy to be intreated*. (*i.v. entreat*, 10, β.)

The following instance is half a century earlier:

- 1526 Tynd. *James III*, 17, the wisdom that is from above is.... *easy to be entreated*.

Tyndale employs the idiom to render εὐπειθής. The Vulgate has 'suadibilis'; Beza renders the Greek word by 'obsequens'. Coverdale and the translators of the *Authorized Version* took over Tyndale's ingenious rendering, which is a great improvement upon Wycliffe-Purvey's 'able to be counselid'.

Puttenham, *Eng. Poesie*, p. 175 uses the idiom in a passage where he discusses the figure of speech eclipsis: 'he is to be intreated, for he is [*ease*] to be intreated'. (*Entreat* by itself, in the sense of 'prevail upon', 'persuade', is now obsolete).

A recent example of the expression is found in the *O. E. D.*, signification 2, b of *eath*, *eith* being defined as follows: 'Of a person: Easy to be entreated.' The same definition is given of signification (2) of *eape* in Bosw.-Toller, *A. S. Dict.* Supplement.

13. Poutsma, l. c. p. 459, section 83, calls attention to the curious construction found in 'He is not easily to be shaken'. Poutsma gives several examples in which *easily* is used in this way; he quotes one in which *hardly* figures. The construction is the result of contamination, 'it is easily done' and 'it is easy to be done' having been rolled into one. Poutsma seems to hint at this; l. c. p. 460, top. Another curious form of contamination is illustrated in the following quotation:

1460-80 *Old Treatise*, in *Rede me* etc., p. 184, then shall we mowe easely to be amendid.

The earliest examples I can give of the construction pointed out by Poutsma, are:

- 1577 Googe in *Heresbach's Husb.* III (1586), 139, The olde Ewes.... be easilyer to be entreated (= to deal with). *O.E.D.* i.v. *entreat* 1, α.
1580 Lyly, *Euphues* II, 366, Many similytudes thou bringest in to excuse thy youth.... which are as easelye to be refelled, as they are to be repeated.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAFF.

Analysis and Synthesis in English.

The morphological structure of a language depends on the operation of two opposite tendencies, analysis and synthesis. In those languages in which the former tendency prevails, the modifications of the basic meaning of words, or the relations of words in combinations, are denoted by "auxiliary" words or by means of word order, whereas those languages in which the synthetical tendency is more highly developed than the analytical, express the same functions and modifications of meaning by affixes and changes in the root syllables. Thus the functions of the genitive singular, denoted by five endings in Latin and in Czech, have their equivalent expression in the prepositions *of* and *in* (e.g. *the fall in the franc*) in English. Verbal aspects, which are systematically expressed in Slavonic languages by morphological changes of the verb, can be denoted in English by word groups, e.g. *he used to go*, *was going*, *would go*, *often went* (*často chodíval*; cf. the usual grammatical concord of the adverb *často* with the iterative aspect of the verb in Czech). When we speak of analytical and synthetical languages (or stages of a language), it is understood that we use these words in a relative and comparative sense. The comparison between English and the Slavonic languages

shows us that the analytical tendency is stronger in the former than in the latter, and in the development of English itself we can trace the strengthening of this tendency in a manner hardly paralleled in any other European language. Underlying this change of synthetical constructions into analytical ones, and vice versa, there must be psychological motives causing the speakers to use or prefer analytical (or synthetical) means of expression, and the hearers to adopt them.

Before offering to explain this linguistic phenomenon, we shall try to characterize the morphology of Modern English from the point of view of the analytical tendency. In comparison with Modern German, this tendency manifests itself in the combination of the verb with a prepositional adverb, e.g. *get in* = *enter*, *get out* = *leave*, *get down* = *descend*, *make up* = *complete*, *make out* = *discover*, and in the combinations of nouns which are equivalent in meaning to the corresponding German compounds. Such German combinations as *Hauptrolle*, *Bahnhof*, *Kriegsruf* result from the analytical process of thought, like the English synonymous equivalents *chief part*, *railway station*, *war-cry*; but they differ from them in the relative strength of the reaction which the synthetical tendency exercises against the analytical one. Whereas in German this reaction is so strong that it gives rise to real compounds, in English it offers little resistance to the latter tendency, so that the two members of such combinations are felt, morphologically, to be two independent words, the analytical tendency having free play. Such cases as *in a more baby state*, *a most silver flow*, where *baby* and *silver* function as adjectives, seem to prove, in spite of their exceptional character, that the combinations in question are not real compounds. Some original substantives (cf. *choice*, *dainty*) are now real adjectives, admitting the suffixes of the comparative and superlative degrees. The strong analytical tendency of English leads also to the morphological levelling of nouns and verbs. The same word can function as either a noun or a verb according to its position in the sentence unit, so that we are hardly entitled to speak, from the standpoint of word morphology, of nouns and verbs as distinct parts of speech. The endings are not enough to distinguish verbs from nouns as they are partly common to both verbs and nouns, and it is only the position between the subject and the nominal part of the predicate which causes a word to function as a verb. Owing to the sentence morphology of English in which the verb is apt to sink to the state of a relation word connecting the preceding independent word with the following, the verb is comparatively seldom used without an object or adverb. The increasing tendency to maintain the usual "pattern" accounts for the loss of impersonal constructions in Early Modern English, as well as for the use of the progressive forms instead of the simple ones in the absence of verbal complements, e.g. *the sun is shining* instead of *the sun shines*. The lack of distinction between adverbs and prepositions (cf. *in*, *about*, *off*, *to*, *within*) which English has in common with German, is due to the same analytical tendency sweeping away those marks of their distinct functions in the sentence which have been so well preserved in the Slavonic languages.

On the other hand, English has retained, in opposition to French, many living affixes showing that the synthetical tendency is still active in the language. The ease and regularity with which new words are derived by means of a number of prefixes and suffixes (such as *un-*, *ex-*, *re-*, *extra-*, *pre-*, etc.; *-ness*, *-ship*, *-ist*, *-like*, *-less*, *-able*, *-ize*), reminding us of agglutination in some families of languages, may well be due to the origin of the suffixes, which are either originally independent words, or were borrowed

from Latin and engrafted into the body of the English language, for the most part, at the time of the Renaissance.

The analytical tendency in English is clearly displayed in forming feminine nouns from the corresponding masculines. Since the beginning of the xiiith century, together with the decay of grammatical gender, English has gradually lost the unrestricted power of deriving feminines and has replaced derivation by the juxtaposition of words denoting sex, e.g. *gentleman visitor: lady visitor; manservant: maidservant; man voter: woman voter*, etc., or by that of personal pronouns. These combinations, however, are not on a level with the corresponding derivative nouns in German or Czech, as the words *man, woman, gentleman, lady, male, female*, in addition to the notion of sex convey another classificatory meaning not implied in the meaning of the respective German or Czech suffixes; nevertheless, we may take them as analytical indications of sex, because the formation of feminines by means of suffixes still exists in English (cf. *quaker, quakeress*), and the words denoting the sex tend to lose their full meaning in the combinations concerned. The loss of special derivative suffixes as well as the enlarged meaning of the suffix *-estre*, which had been limited in Anglo-Saxon to feminines, show that the expression of the notion of sex is not felt to be necessary in Modern English, so that in this respect English bears the same relation to German as German (and English) do in respect of the expression of verbal aspects, when compared with the Slavonic languages, where every word must be in one of the classes of this grammatical category.

The synthetical and analytical means of expression of the same notion also exist side by side in the case of the comparison of adjectives and adverbs. It is a characteristic feature of English morphology that the old synthetical forms have not been supplanted by analytical constructions to the exclusion of the latter, as was the case in Old French, but have only been restricted to monosyllabic adjectives and to such dissyllabic ones as are stressed on the second syllable. Dr. Kruisinga's suggestion (cf. *English Studies* Vol. VI, 1924) that the use of synthetical comparison depends on rhythmical factors, is probably correct, because the analytical constructions have not replaced the derivative suffixes even in the dissyllabic adjectives which end in a vowel or diphthong or syllabic *l* and *n* (cf. *happy: happier; yellow: yellower, bitter: bitterer; simple: simpler, common: commoner*), the comparative and superlative having the same number of syllables as the positive. Apart from rhythmical factors, the tendency to avoid comparatives which could be misinterpreted as *nomina agentis* sometimes leads to the preference of the analytical construction. Speakers seem to prefer forms like *more divine, more correct*, to the synthetical comparative in order to distinguish them from the corresponding agent nouns, whereas the suffixes are freely used in the case of adjectives which never function as verbs, e.g. *remote, polite, sincere, severe*. The synthetical superlative, however, is used even of adjectives like *correct* and *divine*. The striving for clearness also seems to result in the regular use of the analytical comparison of adjectives standing after their head-nouns, e.g. *a step more true, a foot more light, something still more new*. The fact that such adjectives as *tired, staid, pleased, charming* have analytical comparison, is easily accounted for as due to the analogy of the definitely verbal forms.

Where both means of expressing comparison may be used with the same adjective, the choice between them depends on questions of meaning and emphasis. The synthetical comparative and superlative forms lay greater emphasis on the quality expressed by the adjective, the analytical constructions

emphasize difference in the degree of the quality. Analytical comparison is, therefore, never used to express the classifying meaning as in *the younger (elder) son, my youngest (eldest) brothers*, cf. *mon frère aîné (cadet)* in French; *the latest fashion*, etc. The frequent use of the adjectives *pire, meilleur*, etc., which have survived in Modern French, is perhaps sufficient to explain their preservation. Differentiation between the two functions of comparison, the classifying and the actually comparative, is carried through in the adjective *old*. Further, the need of emphasis leads to the preference of the one or the other means of comparison. Analytical constructions are more emphatic because each idea, i.e. quality and degree, is expressed separately, and are used in stressed positions especially at the close of the sentence, which is as a rule more emphatic than the preceding words, and contains some new or important complements requiring a precise and emphatic expression. (Cf. the use of the prepositions *of* and *to* instead of the genitive and before the indirect object when these are given end-position.)

The use of analytical adverbs expressed by means of nouns preceded by prepositions (e.g. *of necessity* = *necessarily*; *of deliberation* = *deliberately*; *of course, of one's own accord, free will, choice, at last*) — or by means of adjectives, followed by a noun (e.g. *this way, in such a way, in this manner, on this account*) is due to similar tendencies, such as the wish to avoid long words (e.g. *of necessity* instead of *necessarily*) or the repetition of the same ending (e.g. *in a friendly way* instead of *friendlily*), or to the needs of stress and differentiation of meaning, as in the use of analytical comparison. The need of emphasis resulting from the position of adverbs after verbs or often at the end of a sentence, probably led to the generalization of the adverbial ending *-ly* instead of the older *-e*, at the time when the verb received its fixed position after the subject.

It is well known that the analytical perfect and pluperfect forms as well as the passive constructions which supplanted the original synthetic forms were fully developed as early as the oldest written monuments of Anglo-Saxon. As far back as this early period of the English language may be traced the periphrastic future and subjunctives, as well as the construction of *bēon* + *present participle* (e.g. *feohtende wæron*) and that of *willan* + *infinitive*, expressing verbal aspects. The construction *dōn* + *infinitive*, expressing the causative meaning of a verb in an analytical way, developed in Early Middle English. Characteristic of Modern English are the constructions of *have* + *verbal noun* (e.g. *he had a swim, have a ride*!) and of *two verbs connected with and* (*he came and saw what happened*). The periphrasis of the verb by *do* + *infinitive* came into general use during the xviiith century as a morphological result of the tendency to separate the subject of an interrogative sentence from its object by means of the verb (cf. M. Deutschbein, *System der neuenglischen Syntax*, p. 78, etc.) or, in negative sentences, to place the negative particle *not* before the verb without changing the word order (cf. O. Jespersen, *Negation in English and Other Languages*, p. 11). In positive sentences the periphrasis of the verb by *do* + *infinitive* has been retained as a convenient means of expressing emphasis (cf. *I do write* corresponding to *you don't write* or *do you write*?)

As with the comparison of adjectives, analytical constructions have not completely supplanted the synthetic forms of the genitive, the use of which is now almost restricted to substantives denoting persons (or certain larger animals) and personified things, perhaps in consequence of the association of its endings *-es, -ys* with the pronoun *his* at the end of the Middle English period. The choice between the two means of expressing genitive

relations, where both are permissible, depends mainly on considerations of meaning and emphasis.

The analysis of cases in Early Middle English has attracted the attention of many linguists, and various explanations of this process have been proposed. According to an old theory, now hardly retained by any philologist, it was due to the direct influence of Old French. O. Jespersen explains the replacing of synthetical forms by analytical constructions as due to the mixing of Anglo-Saxon case endings with Old Norse, and the resulting weakening of their meaning. G. Hübener (cf. *Das Problem des Flexionschwundes im Angelsächsischen*. P. B. B., Vol. XLV, p. 85, etc.) and J. Ries (*Die Wortstellung im Beowulf*) regard the change of the free word order into the fixed position of words in sentence units as the cause of the analysis of cases, but they offer no conclusive proof of their theory. The loss of case-endings in Early Middle English cannot be responsible for the rise of analysis, as the genius of the language could easily have formed new endings, as with adverbs. Moreover, the general tendency of replacing synthetical forms by analytical constructions in accordance with the needs of emphasis (and differentiation of meaning) appears in Old-English. When reading Anglo-Saxon poetry I noticed that the synthetic instrumental occurs mostly in pre-verbal position whereas, when preceded by the verb, the prepositions *fram*, *þuruh*, *mid*, etc. + a noun are the rule, e.g. *synnum asundran*; *asundrad fram synnum*; *mec mon folmum biwand*, *bipeahte mec mid þearfum wædum* (Christ 1422). Periphrasis and the use of the less usual word order is chosen mainly as a result of the tendency to emphasis and differentiation of meaning, here as well as in the other instances adduced. This tendency, however, does not explain the general "drift" of some languages to analysis and that of others to synthesis, as emphasis and differentiation can be expressed either synthetically or analytically.

It is often held, although not *expressis verbis*, that the growth of analytical structures in a language is a distinctive mark of its progress, if we take progress in language as its widening capability to express varying shades of meaning and emphasis. This view is hardly correct. Both structures meet these needs as they arise equally well and both are as a rule represented in the development of a language. In both cases the force of expression declines by the process of mechanization, as well as the exactness of meaning by the extension of it. The prepositions *of*, *to*, *for*, the verbs *will*, *shall*, etc. which express the notions conveyed in the suffixes or prefixes of other languages, have very often as many functions as the affix *-a*, *-ae*, etc. in a synthetical language, in addition to their original meaning, so that a lesser degree of differentiation in meaning may obtain in the analytical stage of a language than in the older synthetical one. The fact that the growth of analysis has sometimes taken place in a period of cultural decline when the language was losing nuances of thought and feeling, as in Latin, shows that the analytical tendency has nothing to do with the progress of language, as one is inclined to think after reading O. Jespersen's valuable and suggestive book "Progress in Language". Morsbach's view that the growing tendency to analysis is due to the development of thought and culture, which broke down the narrow limitations of meaning expressed by affixes, does not take into account the possibility of forming new derivative means of expression by the formal coalescence of two words (e.g. the formation of the future and the conditional in French). Analysis is a purely morphological phenomenon as well as synthesis, and the change of synthetical forms into analytical constructions (and vice versa), caused mainly by the needs of emphasis,

depends on morphological facts, which are based in their turn upon the *morphological feeling* in our mind. In English this feeling appears as the *syntagmatical* or *sentence feeling*, in Slavonic languages as the *etymological* or *word feeling*. The sentence feeling leads to the conception of a word as a morphologically unchanged unit and as a member of the sentence, and prevents the analysis of the word into its parts and the derivation of new words. The etymological feeling on the other hand makes the speaker feel words as composed of several parts and leads him to derive new words. The members of the sentence in synthetical languages are felt to be more independent of the sentence unit than in analytical languages in which the words acquire various functions according to their respective positions in the sentence, and in the various combinations expressed in synthetical languages by the modifications of the words themselves. In its extreme the analytical tendency leads to the isolative type of languages, the synthetical tendency to the polysynthetic type.¹⁾ The change of the synthetical construction into the corresponding synonymous analytical one is possible in languages where the "drift" to analysis prevails owing to the capability of the words combined, which express the same notion periphrastically, to lose their full meaning in the combination, so that this periphrasis supplants the synthetical forms which have fallen into disuse for various reasons. In synthetical languages the forms falling into disuse are supplanted by other affixes because there is not always a corresponding word combination equal in emphasis. This *sinking* of the full meaning of some words, which enables periphrastic constructions to function instead of synthetical forms, has escaped the attention of many linguists.

The prevailing sentence feeling in English accounts for its characteristic feature, i.e. for the etymological polysemy, the growth of which goes hand in hand with the increase of analysis. By the adjective *etymological* a distinction is made between this kind of polysemy and that which arises by the metaphorical use of the same "word". The fact that the language did not react against so many homophones, without any loss of clearness, also seems to be connected with the developing sentence feeling. The less the speaker is inclined to analyze a word into its parts, and the more he feels words as functional units in combinations, the less the need is felt to react against the coalescence of words etymologically distinct. In the spelling, however, distinctions between homonyms are preserved as they facilitate the understanding of the text. This tendency hardly supports the movement towards simplified spelling.

The syntagmatical feeling in Modern English is kept alive by the influence of Latin morphology. Apart from a number of suffixes and prefixes which remind us of agglutination, words which are felt to be connected by the same root and to form an etymological group, are of Latin origin (cf. *social*, *associate*, *society*) and used mostly by the cultured classes. The fact that words do not form solid morphological complexes in English explains the

¹⁾ The analysis of these two mental dispositions belongs to the sphere of psychology, and the present writer will probably be excused if he abstains from giving a psychological explanation of the phenomena in this place.

Dr. Kruisinga has kindly drawn my attention to "the well-known fact that English people, because they are accustomed to such pairs of words as *hand*: *manual*, *head*: *capital* and to the thousands of Romance words which are substitutes for O.E. compounds, are less inclined to expect a word to express a meaning other than arbitrarily. To an Englishman a word is a tool that he does not examine, and that he does not care for except as a tool."

great power of English to assimilate foreign words. In synthetical languages words of foreign origin are either treated as native ones and form a basis for many derivatives, or, if isolated, they tend to disappear.

In conclusion, we may revert to the interesting question already stated, whether an analytical language is more perfect from the technical point of view as an instrument for the expression of human thought and feeling. The simplicity of English morphology suggests the idea that English is more perfect than synthetic languages, as the same grammatical relations are expressed by the same simple means, e.g. the preposition *of* corresponds to many endings, e.g. *-a*, *-e*, *-u*, *-i*, *-y* in Modern Czech. If we understand progress in language as the constant simplification of expression, it may be admitted that such simplicity is really an advantage for the speaker. The analytical structure, however, offers greater difficulties to the hearer, as the same morphological units denote a far greater number of meanings and functions than in synthetical languages. Moreover, the memorizing of so many words and word combinations lacking any regularity of formation, is no unqualified advantage of the language in which sentence morphology replaces word etymology. In English, however, the inconvenience of analysis is tempered by the presence of so many borrowed words of Latin origin.

Prague.

B. TRNKA.

Notes and News.

The New English Dictionary. To celebrate the completion of the New English Dictionary¹⁾ an exhibition of books illustrating the history of English dictionaries has been held in the Bodleian Library at Oxford. The exhibits numbered 55, and ranged from the tenth century down to the present-day. The Catalogue (price 6d.) contains a Foreword by C. T. O(nions), with much valuable information on the history of English lexicography.

The Goldsmiths' Company, which in 1905 contributed £ 5,000 towards the cost of the sixth volume, celebrated the completion of the Dictionary at a dinner given in Goldsmiths' Hall on June 6. An address delivered on this occasion by the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon Stanley Baldwin, has been printed and published by the Clarendon Press (price 1/—). It is interesting to read, both for the subject it deals with, and as a good specimen of English after-dinner oratory. Referring to the gift of the Goldsmiths' Company Mr. Baldwin expressed regret that the Government did not have something to do with the expense of producing the Dictionary. He might have pointed to the pension of £ 250 a year conferred by the English Government on Dr. Murray, some time after the publication of the first part. (See C. Stoffel's review of Part I in the fifth volume of *Taalstudie*, 1884, p. 306).

It may not be superfluous to add that much interesting information on the history of the Dictionary is given in *The Periodical* for 15 February, 1928. Copies of this pamphlet are sent by the Oxford University Press post free to any applicant (apply to Mr. Humphrey Milford, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E. C. 4.)

¹⁾ We should like to endorse a remark made in the August number of *American Speech* by Professor A. G. Kennedy, who urges that 'New English Dictionary', not 'Oxford English Dictionary', should be retained as the general appellation. The abbreviation O. E. D. is inconveniently suggestive of *Old English Dictionary*; whereas, without for a moment denying 'credit to the great Oxford Press, to the University, and to those Oxford scholars that have done so much to promote the work', we agree with Prof. Kennedy 'that this recent emphasis of the "Oxford" in the name seems unnecessary local advertising.'

Cambridge Summer Meeting. This year's Summer Meeting at Cambridge was devoted to *The Victorian Age*. Victorian politics, Victorian prose and poetry, Victorian music and painting, all passed in review. Perhaps we have too much of the nineties in us (generally described as 'naughty', as Mr. Roberts said in his interesting lecture) to appreciate the subject as a whole. But many very good lectures were delivered on political, religious and literary topics. Professor Grant's competency and tact were generally admired in his lectures on Victorian politics; and although Sir John Marriott, M. P., is perhaps just a bit too John Bullish (his own words!) to speak about politics before an audience containing so many foreigners, his lectures were certainly very entertaining. So were those of Mr. Hannah ('The Empire in Asia' and 'The Dominions').

Some enjoyable lectures on literary subjects were given by Miss Hughes ('The Brontës'); Mr. Ernest Breul ('The Approach to Thackeray'); Mr. Hardman ('Thomas Hardy'); and Mr. Babington ('George Eliot'). Owing to the bad acoustics of the Hall some other lectures, which may have been excellent, were quite lost upon many listeners. Lectures with lantern slides, e. g. those of Dr. Cranage on 'Cambridge and Architecture' made a pleasant change. The lectures on education were rather disappointing, and overcrowded the programme, especially for those who followed the foreigners' classes.

In other respects everything was done to give everybody a happy and profitable time. The Vice-Chancellor gave a delightful garden party in Sidney Sussex College, one of the most picturesque colleges. Many other invitations were received and gratefully accepted. Excursions were arranged to Ely, Peterborough and Norwich. Large parties also visited Chivers' factories and Buckdon Palace, Mr. Eddlestone's property, situated at some distance from Cambridge.

Cambridge itself is a very attractive place with its many old buildings and beautiful college grounds. The backs of the colleges with the lovely gardens along the river make some very pretty pictures. Rowing and punting are favourite pastimes. A very nice trip on the river Granta can be made to Grantchester with its old St. Andrew's Church, commonly known as Rupert Brooke's Church.

Many things well worth mentioning will be found wanting in this short survey. It is impossible to express in a few words all one owes to a holiday spent either at Oxford or Cambridge. Both places have their own particular charms and advantages, and both are to be warmly recommended to foreign students of English. — M. B. K.

We understand that the next Summer Meeting will be held at Oxford, for three weeks, beginning from about August 2, 1929. The main subject of study will be *England and English Literature in the Stuart Period*. Ticket for the Summer Meeting, £ 2 2s.; or for either Part (consisting of 10 days), £ 1 10s. Special classes will be provided for a small additional fee. A *Guide to Preparatory Reading* (price 4d., post free) and the Preliminary Programme will be ready in March, 1929. The latter will be sent post free to all applicants. Information may be obtained from the Secretary: Rev. F. E. Hutchinson, M. A., Delegacy for Extra-mural Studies, Rewley House, Wellington Square, Oxford.

English Association in Holland. Bulletin no. 7 of the Association has just been published, containing particulars of next winter's programme. It includes lectures on *Folklore* by Miss E. N. Dorothy Brewer, on *Rudyard Kipling* by Rev. F. de W. Lushington, lectures by Major Worswick, of the Polytechnic, London, and recitals of poetry and music by Miss Irene Sadler and Clive Carey.

Details of membership may be obtained from the secretary of the nearest local branch. The General Secretary's address is Mr. C. Bakker, 472 Heeren-gracht, Amsterdam.

Reviews.

The Complete Works of John Webster. Edited by F. L. LUCAS. London, Chatto and Windus, 1927. Four Volumes: I, pp. xviii + 288; II, pp. vi + 372; III, pp. vi + 340; IV, pp. viii + 274. 18/- net each vol.

Few personalities are more elusive than Webster's. As soon as we try to picture the whole man, and to reconcile in the same individual the genius who wrote the two famous macabre tragedies with the author of a few forgotten plays and some indifferent verse, we feel that, with the Duchess of Malfy, we are "going into a wilderness" where we "shall find no path, nor friendly clewe" to be our guide. From the artist, who approaches us with a halting gait which has decidedly none of the graces of *Elegia's* limping in Ovidius's personification, we turn then to the man, to see whether we may discover in his life such a turning point as would enable us to bridge over the gulf between the two groups of his productions. But, alas, the man is nothing but *nomen et umbra*. When was he born? When did he die? Was he identical with a Magister Johannes Webster, member of the Middle Temple, as Mr. Lucas convincingly suggests? What kind of a man was he? That he was a slow writer, he says himself in the preface to *The White Devil*; we find his laborious parturitions ridiculed by an enemy, a lawyer of Lincoln's Inn. His was, probably, the not uncommon case of the writer provided with a vivid, but limited strain of inspiration: two plays were enough to exhaust it. In those two plays we find the same themes explored in all their shades and possibilities, squeezed to the dregs. After them, the poet had sung his song, but the playwright remained, who continued to write plays as his professional job, just as well as he could have pleaded in the law-courts, had he chosen the forensic career for his livelihood. If he was fully aware of the height from which he had fallen, we may feel sure that his was an unhappy life. Nothing is sadder than to be the survival of one's better self. We may, then, understand why he took to writing plays so different in mood and style from his prodigious twins. He must have hated the superior self of former days, and tried to build up an independent personality against it, from sheer self-preservation. It is difficult to accept resignedly the common lot, when one has tasted the inebriating godlike experience of great creative work. Webster must have fought to the last, in order to persuade himself that he was still alive as an artist: perhaps he flung humorous farce and classical tragedy in the face of the gloomy poet

of *The White Devil* and *The Duchess of Malfy*, as a challenge. But inspiration had gone for ever.

The tragedy of the artist in Webster possibly lies in a process like the one just described; but Mr. Lucas suggests another explanation, based on the preface to *The White Devil*, where Webster seems to imply that, had it been in his choice, he would have written classical plays, but that the taste of "the incapable multitude" had persuaded him that such a course would have been waste of labour. Though he sided, theoretically, with Aristotle, he followed *deteriora*. That, in his two great tragedies, Webster constantly kept an eye on the public, is certain, as we shall see in a moment, but no less certain is the fact that, whatever theories Webster *qua* dramatic critic may have entertained, *qua* artist he shared the taste of "the incapable multitude". This coincidence was "a happy accident", as Mr. Lucas remarks, but no more than an accident. Because Webster's essential features were what they were, and no "capable multitude" could ever have turned him into a successful emulator of Ben Jonson.

The notion of Webster as of an Elizabethan Poe, or of a poet who wreathed his roses only about a skull, has been so persistently harped on, that one cannot help feeling sympathy with Mr. Lucas for his attempt at undermining it, were it only in details. What more amusing than Symonds's interpretation of the expression (in *The White Devil*, IV, ii, 21) "coffin'd in a bak't meate" as an example of Webster's macabre mind, whereas "to coffin" for "to enclose in pie-crust" was current in Elizabethan times? What more preposterous than Rupert Brooke's comment on a passage in *The Devil's Law-Case* (III, ii, 162): "Is the wind in that doore still?", as an instance of midnight ghastliness, whereas that expression is a common old English idiom synonymous with: "is that how the land lies?" But perhaps the madmen scene (IV, ii) in *The Duchess of Malfy* provides the best instance of anachronistic interpretation on the part of modern critics, who have seen in it the crowning horror in that sensational tragedy. Well, madmen were not objects of horror to the Elizabethans, but merely of entertainment! Does not a servant say that the Pope was cured of a deep melancholy by a show of madmen, "which wilde object (Being full of change and sport,) forc'd him to laugh"? (*Duchess of Malfy*, IV, ii, 42 ff.) So that, far from contributing to enhance the horror of the spectators, those madmen were calculated to "give relief from the tragic climax," in the way of a half-comic interlude. This opinion of Mr. Lucas on the significance of the "wild consort of Mad-men" is however, qualified by what he says in a note (Vol. II, p. 181), that "what had been a mere matter of horseplay was used to deepen tragic pity and terror". To the audience of the Globe madness may have been primarily funny, but there is little doubt that Webster intended to make it appear more or less what it appears to modern readers. Would Cariola otherwise be caused to say: "This tyranny, I thinke was never practis'd till this howre", and the Duchess to reply that the spectacle of folly, instead of producing in her the effect aimed at by her brother (to make her "starke mad") would keep her in her right wits? On the other hand, the ravings of the madmen answer to the convention which saw only the funny side of madness. There is nothing tragic about them; rather they strike a note of grotesqueness in the same way as (in the fifth act of *The White Devil*) does the delirium of Brachiano, whose speeches "are severall kinds of distractions and in the action should appeare", according

to the stage direction.¹⁾ What are the madmen raving about? What does Brachiano see in his distraction? Grotesque things similar to those which people the cavern of St. Anthony or the infernal kingdoms painted by Hieronymus Bosch. Obviously, seventeenth century people enjoyed such quaint inventions, and Webster, though he saw well enough the tragic effect to which they could be made subservient, went only half-way, compromised. The significance of the madmen show, in the drama, would be that of an additional torture, the most cruel of all; but, in the actual performance, that show turns out to be nothing else but a grotesque interlude. The men who crowded the Phoenix and the Red Bull were not very different from a modern cinema-audience — says Mr. Lucas, not without reason; they cared chiefly for the spectacular, and Webster possessed to an eminent degree the sense of the spectacular. The taste for processions, jousts, investitures, in a word, gorgeous display of every description, was inborn in the crowds of the Renaissance: see how many shows Webster contrives to cram into his plays! A papal election with all the elaborate ceremonial, tournaments and sittings of the court of justice (these last two shows are features both of *The White Devil* and *The Devil's Law-Case*), the ceremony of "a Cardinal's installment in the habit of a Soldier". He lays so much stress on the pageant, that I have no doubt that he altered some of the incidents in the stories he prepared for the stage, merely for the sake of introducing some exciting show. The historical Isabella was strangled, and Francesco Peretti was shot in an ambush; but in the play the deaths of those two characters are respectively caused by a poisoned picture and a vaulting-horse: strange, spectacular means. For the same reason Brachiano, instead of dying of disease (not without the suspicion of poison, usual at that epoch in the case of the deaths of princes), is first poisoned with a poisoned helmet — an excellent device, which, besides being itself strange, allows the author to stage a tournament — and then strangled in his deathbed by Ludovico and Gasparo in the habit of Capuchins — another excellent device, since thus we are enabled to assist at a religious ceremony with solemn Latin versicles. And what about the courtesan Julia dispatched by the Cardinal by means of a poisoned Bible? And why does Ferdinand become a lycanthropic madman, if not because Webster thought that fits of that strange disease would have been particularly effective on the stage, even more effective than the distractions of the madmen?

In this latter case Webster combined his taste for the spectacular with another strain no less powerful in him: the sense of dramatic correlations, for which his tragedies, somehow, curiously foreshadow such modern use of *leit-motive* as we find in Wagner, Ibsen and Hardy. Ferdinand is caused to go mad exactly as he would have caused his sister to, by surrounding her with mad people. See how many purposes Webster has made his inventions serve! Two more instances may suffice. Poisoned Brachiano

¹⁾ Also Cornelia (*White Devil*, V, iv) is caused to go mad and entertain the audience with "severall formes of distraction". In *Hamlet* and *King Lear* (chiefly III, iv) are remarkable instances of the vogue for madmen on the stage. Webster seems to have looked to Shakespeare as his model for this as well as for other features in his dramas: so the character of Bosola and the shadow of melancholy cast across *The Duchess of Malfy* cannot fail to remind one of *Hamlet*. Repentant Bosola is akin to repentant Edmund in *King Lear*, V, iii. A passage from More's *Utopia* (II, 7: *Voluptas e Morionibus. Moriones in delitiis habentur*, etc.) could be conveniently quoted to illustrate the vogue for madmen. Mad songs were generally modelled on nursery songs: they are the songs learnt in childhood and recalled in madness. See H. Littledale, *The Mad Songs in "The Two Noble Kinsmen"* in *Mod. Lang. Notes* V (1910).

says to Vittoria: "Do not kisse me, for I shall poyson thee." Now, it was by kissing Brachiano's *likeness* that his first wife, Isabella, had actually died (first pointed out by S. Minto, in *Characteristics of English Poets*.) The tragic implications of this parallelism are not confined to perfect retaliation; there is a subtler thrill caused by the fact that one episode looks as if it were the prefiguration of the other, so that the words of Brachiano possess almost the spell of a Wagnerian *leit-motif*. A similar case we find in *The Duchess of Malfy*. "Notice that of the two lovers, the Duchess and Antonio" — says Mr. Lucas (Vol. II, p. 197) — "each dies with the voice of Bosola whispering, like an evil angel turned pitiful at last, tidings of the other's fate." There is much more than this in the correlation. In the case of the Duchess (IV, ii) Bosola hopes *to recall her to life* (so that he may himself recover his peace of conscience) by whispering the *happy* tidings that Antonio is alive. But to dying Antonio Bosola whispers the *distressing* news that the Duchess and the children are murdered *in order that his heart may break quickly*. The correlation between the two episodes enhances the sense of tragic irony which is part and parcel of Bosola's fate. A malignant destiny wrecks the good intentions of this most pathetic among Elizabethan villains, who could hardly have existed before Hamlet: all his acts are cursed, so that unwittingly he kills that very Antonio he meant to save "above his own life". In his mouth are put the well-known lines:

We are meerely the starres tennys-balls (strooke, and banded
Which way please them).

Webster has considerably refined upon the conception of fatality the Elizabethans had derived from Seneca. He is not content with enunciating the iron rule; he weaves it into the very essence of the characters, and thickens round them that atmosphere of foreboding which has been acutely analysed by Mr. Lucas (in the General Introduction). With Webster, words are loaded with a distant meaning; he has a consummate mastery of sinister equivocation hardly second to Hardy's, and the critic is perfectly justified in seeing — as Mr. Lucas does — hints lurking in seemingly innocent passages. The deft use of tone-technique gives to Webster's two masterpieces a unity and a compactness which his uncertain command of the psychology of the characters would not have achieved. There is a unity of inspiration in both tragedies, so that they complete each other, they represent the same thing seen through two different mediums. There is a meridian quality about the tragedy of Vittoria, as much as there is a twilight quality in the story of the Duchess of Malfy. Mr. Lucas feels more in sympathy with the undaunted spirit of the courtesan than with the martyr's passiveness of the Duchess: but this is really only a matter of personal liking. Because the mood of either tragedy is perfectly attuned: the tragedy of the Duchess is, so to say, the evening of the day of which the tragedy of the courtesan is the noon. It is all a matter of shades, the ground is the same. This "difference of tone which goes together with the innumerable parallels of situation and idea to be found in these twin plays"¹ has been analysed by Mr. Lucas as it had

¹) It may be worth while noticing how the central theme of the two tragedies, the persecution of lovers by cruel relatives, had been a popular one with the Italian Senecans. In Giral di Cinthio's *Orbecche*, the tyrant Sulmone, bent on punishing his daughter for her secret marriage with a youth of lower caste, almost anticipates the cruelty of Ferdinand in *The Duchess of Malfy* by presenting his daughter with the head and the hands of the murdered husband and the bodies of the children: by this show he wants his daughter to suffer such sorrow that death would be deemed a relief in comparison.

never been done so acutely before, and hardly will be in the future (Vol. II, p. 18 ff.). Mr. Lucas rightly sees mirrored in Webster's tragedies the final disillusionment of the Renaissance. *The Duchess of Malfy* seems to me to have matured in the same climate in which grew Tasso's masterpiece (taking into account the belatedness of the English Renaissance): the same season of decaying light — evening or autumn — blurs the features of the characters, and almost a foretaste of Romanticism is conveyed to us in words of pathetic tenderness (Tasso was the first to make a frequent use of the typically romantic expression: *non so che*), and in gloomy, heart-rending situations. Antonio walking on the "auncient ruynes" is no less *idolâtre de sa tristesse* than Tancredi. Webster's adroit use, in that scene, of a quotation from Montaigne, by setting it against a proper background calculated to enhance its romantic potentiality, is no less characteristic than his power of remoulding, in the same scene, a commonplace of pastoral poetry, the echo-dialogue, by eliciting from it that wistful sense of foreboding which the earlier writers on the theme had dimly guessed and vainly strived to capture in their rough attempts at burrowing in the hidden meanings of the words. In *The Duchess of Malfy* we have the ripest expression of that mood of funereal elegy which sets in with the decline of the Renaissance, curiously anticipating Romanticism: ¹⁾ a mood which is to be traced not only in literature, but also in painting (Filippino Lippi, Piero di Cosimo). What Webster does by steeping in an atmosphere of twilight melancholy the Renaissance tragedy of blood and horror, can be paralleled by Piero di Cosimo's painting the profile of Simonetta Vespucci — with a snake coiled round her necklace — against a symbolic landscape of sullen sky and stricken trees (emblems of her untimely death). Also in the painting a traditional motif — the full profile of a lady — is treated in a way which would hardly have been conceivable in a Quattrocentist.

In *Epitia*, Epitia is shown the supposed dead body of Vico which proves to be, ultimately, that of a criminal who had been executed in his place. (In *Measure for Measure* Shakespeare took the idea of the substitution of bodies from *Epitia*, since that substitution does not occur either in *Hecatomithi*, Deca VIII, Nov. 5, nor in Whetstone's version of it. Therefore Klein (V, 353) is not accurate when he states that *Measure for Measure* has nothing in common with *Epitia*.) In *Altile*, the heroine, a widow, secretly marries a dependant; the two lovers part in the hope of escaping punishment at the hands of Altile's brother, King Lamano, who inveighs against Altile with taunts similar to those addressed to the Duchess of Malfy by her brothers. (By the way, both *Epitia* and *Altile* are tragi-comedies, as *The Devil's Law-Case*; the audience is held in suspense between horror and pity until the happy ending: a trick which had been a feature of the Greek romance.) However, Webster drew the idea of the wax-figures from the *Arcadia*: Sidney and the Italians, in their turn, were indebted to Achilles Tatius. On the other hand, the theme which Webster found in Bandello's historical account of the Duchess of Malfy had been popular for a long time: Webster raised it to the sphere of great poetry. The theme of the persecuted lovers is also found in *The Spanish Tragedy*. With this latter drama Webster seems to have in common also the trick of locking up his characters, which Lucas (Vol. II, p. 362) finds so peculiar. Hieronimo (IV, iii, 12-13) causes the spectators of his show to be locked up in the gallery, in order that they may not interrupt the course of his revenge. With Webster the device proves fatal to the people who adopt it. That Webster took it from Kyd will seem very probable if we keep in mind the circumstances of *Duch. Malfy*, V, iv-v. Malatesta and his companions appear on the upper stage as the actor-spectators in *The Sp. Trag.*: in both cases these people are prevented from interfering by a false belief that the tragedy which happens under their eyes or within their hearing is a pretence.

¹⁾ With Antonio's speech on the "auncient ruynes" compare, for instance, what Coleridge wrote to Martin: "At Denbigh . . . is the finest ruined castle in the kingdom . . . wandered there two hours in a still evening, feeding upon melancholy."

The supreme words uttered by Webster's heroes on the point of abandoning life are penetrated with a sense of mystery such as we are accustomed to associate with the Romantics. In the early Elizabethan dramas the underworld is represented as a kingdom of dreadful shades and never-changing night: it is the well-defined Stygian landscape of Seneca. But Webster's characters, in dying, are overpowered by the mystery of after-life. Vittoria says:

My soule, like to a ship in a blacke storme
Is driven I know not whither.

The courtesan Julia, in *The Duchess of Malfy*:

I go,
I know not whither.

And the last moments of both Flamineo and Bosola are shrouded "in a mist". In the perception of a mysterious world within the world, of a dim halo haunting the contours of earthly things, Webster is matched only by Chapman among his contemporaries, while he is closely related to Donne for his fondness of the macabre and his suggestive abruptness.¹⁾ There is a fundamental similarity in the genius of such writers as Chapman, Middleton, Webster, Tourneur, Donne, a similarity which T. S. Eliot has tried to define (in *The Sacred Wood*, p. 117) by saying that with all of them "the intellect was immediately at the tips of the senses". They have images instinct with a physical thrill, and they see in concrete things a metaphysical significance: sense and intellect have never perhaps been blended in a more inextricable way than with those poets of the late English Renaissance.

Mr. Lucas's edition is not only to be praised for the high standard of the critical pages, but also for the excellence of the text and the commentary. Though he has aimed first of all at producing such a clear text as the general reader may be able to enjoy, he has not sacrificed to that aim any of the qualities a scholarly edition ought to possess. He keeps the old spelling and the original punctuation, so far as these would not be a source of ambiguity. Those who have misgivings about the practical outcome of a compromise of this kind, may reassure themselves. Mr. Lucas's policy entails, in practice, very few alterations indeed: whenever a change in the spelling has been introduced, this is indicated in the text by the use of square brackets. Thus "their" for "there", if the context admits of a moment's uncertainty, is changed to "the[re]". The system on which slight modifications have been introduced, when necessary, in the punctuation, is satisfactorily explained in the Introduction to the Textual Notes. Mr. Lucas's new departure is to be welcomed: some recent English editors, from fear of meddling with the old text, have found nothing better than to reproduce it as it stands, with all the typographical errors. This practice, which for a time may have been a useful reaction against unscrupulous tampering, threatens to-day to become only a cloak for critical cowardice, which is synonym to incompetence. On the other hand Mr. Lucas's eagerness to conceal from the sensitive eyes of the general reader the critical apparatus and the learned commentary, besides being slightly amusing, is a cause of no little inconvenience to the unfortunate "learned" reader who has to keep the book open in three different places at the same moment. And all this for a questionable notion

¹⁾ Several parallels with Donne's poems are quoted by Mr. Lucas in the notes to the plays and to the *Monumental Column*, on which latter the influence of Donne is very strong. Bosola, in *Duch. Malfy*, II, i, 47 ff. and IV, ii, 123 ff., talks in a style which could not be easily distinguished from that of Donne's lurid sermons.

of the beauty of a page. To me, on the contrary, the presence of a small type commentary is apt to enhance the beauty of the page; and I do not think bibliophiles take to disliking the pages of the early editions of Dante for the fact of their being crammed with glosses. I could expatiate on the beauty of the annotated page with no less enticing similes than those used by the advocates of the unannotated one; I could, for instance, say that the notes at the foot of the page seem to support the text as the pillars bear the reverend effigies of the great poets in Chaucer's *House of Fame*; that they are like heraldic supporters of the nobility of the text . . . But a practical consideration, in my opinion, settles a question which from an aesthetic point of view I consider, not settled but, only debatable: the convenience of the reader.

A few instances of excellent emendations introduced by Mr. Lucas in this edition may be quoted: *White Devil*, III, ii, 237-8, where a parallel passage in Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* has suggested to Mr. Lucas the right reading: "eares as *long* [instead of *loving*] As to my thoughts"; *id.*, V, ii, 201, where *gestes* (stopping-places in a progress) is convincingly suggested, in the notes, instead of the obscure *geesse*; and *Devil's Law-Case*, III, ii, 90-2, which had been misconstrued and wrongly punctuated in the old editions. As for the commentary, Mr. Lucas has availed himself of Mr. H. Dugdale Sykes's manuscript notes on the two great tragedies, placed at his disposal by the kindness of that scholar, so that thanks to the combined efforts of the two critics, this commentary has turned out a monument of erudition and discriminating taste. The case of unsatisfactory interpretation is very rare, I should say almost unique: but such a case is found in the note to *Duchess of Malfy* I, i, 195-8. The passage runs:

You onely will begin, then to be sorry
When she doth end her speech: and wish (in wonder)
She held it lesse vaine-glory, to talke much,
Then your pennance, to heare her.

The penance of the hearer is none; therefore she ought to consider talking to be less of a vainglory than of a penance which does not exist (as a matter of fact Antonio proceeds to show how great a pleasure it is to hear her talking). So, she ought not to let her modesty stop her talking. But Lucas suggests that the passage *might* mean: "You wish she thought, not so much that it was vanity of her to talk, as that it was your appointed penance to hear her (like some fair Father confessor)". He thinks this, however, scarcely possible and would rather read *And* for *Then*. In *White Devil*, I, ii, 149-50, the idea of being "smothered in roses" may have been proverbial, as it is argued in the notes, but it may also be traced back to a passage in the life of *Elagabalus* (in *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, xxi: *Oppressit in tricliniis versatilibus parasitos suos violis et floribus sic ut animam aliqui efflaverint, cum erepere ad summum non possent*). At *White Devil*, IV, i, 96, we are told that Elizabethan laundresses were of proverbially easy virtue. It could be added that they had been such for a long time: Chaucer renders with "lavender" Dante's *meretrice*, in *The Legend of Good Women*, A. Prol., 333 ff.¹⁾ The source of *Duch. Malfy* III, v, 37 ff. is an anecdote told about Louis XI, as I have shown elsewhere.²⁾ *Duch. Malfy* IV, ii, 272 ("But here begin your pity" — *Shewes the children strangled*) is to be paralleled with *Sejanus*, V, x ("Then there begin your pity . . .

¹⁾ See G. P. Krapp's note in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, XVII (1902), pp. 204-6.

²⁾ In my British Academy lecture *Machiavelli and the Elizabethans*, London, 1928.

A son and daughter to the dead Sejanus," etc.). Flamineo's words to Zanche: "Let me embrace thee, toad", remind one of Volpone's words to Mosca (*Volpone*, V, i): "My witty mischief, Let me embrace thee...." In a few cases, as in *White Devil*, V, iii, 41 ff., the commentary does not point out any source, though I suspect the passage to be a borrowed one.

Webster's production, like the Horatian Mermaid, *formosa superne, turpiter atrum desinit in piscem*. The last two volumes of this edition are likely to be left untouched by the general reader; but Mr. Lucas's scholarly acumen is not seen faltering, though he could not be expected to entertain for the inferior works included there the same interest as for the two masterpieces. For *Appius and Virginia* he suggests with apposite arguments the date 1625-7, and does not leave untried any of the sound tests in order to establish Webster's share in that play as well as in *A Cure for a Cuckold*, *Anything for a Quiet Life*, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*. One of the tests of identity upon which Mr. Lucas relies most is stated on p. 140 of the third volume: "The unusual words, the great lines, the memorable phrases of an author — all these are very liable to be stolen; it is the quite ordinary expressions, the habits of speech too undistinguished and unconscious to be the cause or result of deliberate plagiarism, that form the least unsatisfactory of all marks of authorship." On the other hand, as we read on p. 13 of the same volume, one should "avoid basing conclusions on phrases as slight and as likely to be common property as "'Tis confessed'". Metrical evidence is discussed in the Appendix IV, with a sound selection of the specimens: it confirms the conclusions reached on other grounds. Webster's metrical development shows a marked reaction towards regularity, after reaching, in *The Devil's Law-Case*, the extreme point of licence. For *Appius and Virginia* Mr. Lucas thinks that we have to reckon not only with Heywood's collaboration, but also with Webster's imitation of his collaborator. Needless to say, a surmise of this kind is calculated to cause uneasiness in the critics, by shattering the firmest among the tests of identity, since it is the distinctly recognisable features which are likely to be imitated: but the confusing fact of reciprocal influence among collaborators remains true, as it is well proved by a classical instance, the frescoes of the Sixtine Chapel. Mr. Dugdale Sykes first pointed out (in *Notes and Queries*, 11th Series, Vol. VIII) many striking verbal parallels between the *Thirty-Two New Characters* added in the 1615 edition of Overbury's poem, *The Wife*, and Webster's two great plays. Lucas believes that the thirty-two characters are entirely Webster's; a remarkable feature of these characters is that they also show Webster's trick of borrowing from Sidney and Montaigne. Mr. Lucas contests Webster's authorship (first put forward by Lamb) for the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, notwithstanding the Websterian flavour of the Painter scene. The turning of the phrase, the whole run of the prose in that scene seems to him much more like Shakespeare, at any rate, than Webster. T. S. Eliot's opinion on the "additions to *Ieronimo*" deserves to be recorded here: "Of the authorship it can only be said that the lines are by some admirer of Marlowe. This might well be Jonson." (*The Sacred Wood*, p. 73). As is well known, entries in Henslowe's *Diary* for Sept. 25th, 1601, and June 22nd, 1602, record payments made to Ben Jonson for additions to *Ieronimo*. But there has always been extreme difficulty, despite this evidence, in attributing to Jonson anything so romantically unlike the rest of his work as those passages. In the Bibliography, two Italian translations (both, however, of little value) could have been mentioned:

E. Allodoli's translation of *The Duchess of Malfy* and L. Gamberale's translations of the same and of *The White Devil* (these latter published in 1922).

Liverpool.

MARIO PRAZ.

Thyrsus-bearers and Bacchoi.

The Kinds of Poetry. By JOHN ERSKINE. — New York, Duffield, 1920. — Price one dollar and a half, net.

Some Contemporary Poets (1920). By HAROLD MONRO. — London, Parsons. — 7/6.

An Anatomy of Poetry. By A. WILLIAMS-ELLIS. — Blackwell, Oxford. 1922. — 7/6.

On English Poetry: Being an Irregular Approach to the Psychology of this Art, from Evidence Mainly Subjective. By ROBERT GRAVES. — London, Heinemann, 1922. — 8/6.

Poetic Unreason and Other Studies. By ROBERT GRAVES. — London, Cecil Palmer, 1925. — 6/—.

Harold Monro and Robert Graves are well-known poets. Untermeyer's Anthology contains some meritorious verse by John Erskine. I find it difficult not to believe that Mr. Williams-Ellis, too, must have 'courted the Muse' now and then. So all of them might pass for *Bacchoi* (compare *Phaedo*, xiii, 37), for fully initiated 'mystics', save for the disquieting reflection that states of inspiration and ecstasy will not last, and that the Bacchos of the present moment, who feels a god rushing to his lips, and whose every word is wisdom, may in ten minutes have changed — relapsed — into a mere thyrsus-bearer, sans juice, sans vision, sans electric discharges, a sayer of empty sayings, a shouter of mechanical shouts.

When number one of our batch (or thiasos), John Erskine, convicts certain fellow thyrsus-bearers, such as Amy Lowell, indifferent poet and floundering theorist, of this sort of thing, the reader cannot help feeling in agreement with him. But that same reader is apt to lose that feeling when John Erskine, dealing with the *vers-librists*, once more enriches the world of thought with the long-exploded platitude that 'rime and metre are but accompaniments of poetry', and he will ask whether an accurate French prose-translation of Shakespeare contains the same amount of poetry that we find in the original. And when John Erskine gravely tells him that 'great prose, like great verse, often contains great poetry', he will return that great verse being great is great poetry, and that great prose may contain poetical thoughts without losing its character of prose, and he will ask if the following letter from Carlyle to John Stuart Mill (Chelsea, 29th February, 1836) is a poem:

'I got home about seven; after a wonderful day. Larks sang to me, over the red ploughed land, songs beautiful, mysterious, mournful, — of old days. Heavy seamen at Gravesend sat drinking heavy-wet. Then at three the Steamer, crowded miscellaneous as Noah's Ark, tumbled me back to the great Babylon, where for me also there was a little cranny to rest in....'

As a matter of fact it very nearly is:

'I got home about seven;
after a wonderful day.
Larks sang to me,
over the red ploughed land:

Songs beautiful, mysterious, mournful, —
 of old days.
 Heavy seamen at Gravesend
 sat drinking heavy-wet.
 Then at three the Steamer,
 crowded miscellaneous
 as Noah's Ark,
 Tumbled me back to the great Babylon,
 Where for me also
 there was a little cranny to rest in....'

Nothing has been altered here, except for my indication of the 'cadences', and if this had been done not by the present writer, but by Carlyle himself, he would have written a poem, whereas now, being of those to whom metaphorical expression comes naturally, he has uttered a number of poetical thoughts in his rôle of letter-writer.

When I say that a work of literature, just like any work of art, must be judged by the greater or lesser success of its realization of the author's ostensible intention when composing it, I find myself in John Erskine's company. "It is best to judge a poem by the quality that distinguishes its *genre*." (p. 36). And many things that he says about this point as about others (notably about the epic and about scholarship and poetry), are well said.¹⁾

In Harold Monro's book, too, — it is interesting to see how obsolete it has become in the course of just a few years — there are some plums, but on the whole it has very little charm, whether of style or of insight. As regards its rambling, half-hearted style, we may cite his, as a general statement, very debatable opinion that *verse is undoubtedly inferior to prose as a medium, but it is easier to write*. (For the very self-contradictory paragraph in which this sentence occurs, see p. 209.) Harold Monro has certainly written a quantity of verse far excelling *this* prose, but nothing warrants an assumption of his case as typical of the whole quill-driving tribe. As far as my own experience counts for anything I flatly contradict it. The fact is that Harold Monro ought not to have written this book. When a man has fallen out with the Muse he has courted he should not proclaim to the world that the lady's nose is not perfectly straight. The book as a whole is as unjust as a lampoon, unredeemed by the flashes of malicious wit that make a lampoon enjoyable.

Dozens of words — even names — misspelled, debatable statements galore, proverbs with mistakes in them, — all this and more may be laid to the charge of Mr. Williams-Ellis's book, and yet it holds the reader and deservedly so. for the author has put his heart into the thing and written with vigour and zest.

'.... the failure of any system of taken-for-granted morality which the War brought to light, had, of course, a much more direct result than that of merely making the younger poets reconsider their technical creeds. The ethical upheaval had the strongest possible direct influence upon modern verse. What was the old attitude? Milton set out 'to justify the ways of God to Man'. Tennyson was even surer about the facts of morality than he

¹⁾ Compare p. 173: 'There is no such thing as a natural poet, if by natural we mean without art; for all art is continuous in its language, however spontaneous in its impulse, and a poet who was ignorant of the tradition prepared for him, or who did not use it, would be reduced to the same meagreness of expression, in so far as his audience is concerned, as man experienced in the childhood of the race, until some more complex brain began to utter itself in new sounds — sounds novel to its own ears and incomprehensible to others.'

was about the facts of poetry, because, we should now say, he was a good poet and an amateur moralist. It is also arguable that the Byron-Baudelaire-Maupassant-Wilde type of poet was just as sure about moral principles as he, only that their assurance took them the other way; they praised the flowers of evil. Wilde might be said to be, therefore, as it were, the obverse of Tennyson. Each of them was quite sure of what was right and what was wrong, and therefore bandied about moral 'claptrap' with freedom and gusto. The difference between both of them and the modern poet is that he regards the facts of morality from the other end, not as things to be defended, but as things to be ascertained . . . ' (p. 10). Many are the shrewd observations to be found throughout the book, the imperfections of which they outnumber and outweigh, so that the general effect is both instructive and stimulating, even where the reader — as in several chapters on separate poets — is apt to disagree with the author. My own experience as regards lyrical stuff that youngsters will take to is very different from Mr. Williams-Ellis's, whose list, including Crabbe, *Samson Agonistes*, *The Old Stoic*, *Character of the Happy Warrior*, etc. fairly made me gasp. The author's ideas on the function of metre are akin to those developed by Souriau in 'La Suggestion dans l'Art'. He is also a staunch upholder of the view that an author ought to strive to make himself intelligible to his prospective audience. 'Art is a subtle form of communication, and a poet needs a public almost as much as a public needs a poet.'

Between Robert Graves's two volumes there is a great gulf fixed, typified by the fact that they have been published by different firms. In my opinion the advantage is everywhere with the older volume. It was a welcome thing, to be told by a modern, unconventional poet that constant rhythmic control over the reader is an essential part of Poetry proper, and that to expect it in prose poetry is to be disappointed.¹⁾ And whether Religion is really a modified descendant of primitive Magic or no, Robert Graves was certainly right in insisting that a genuine poet is of the blood of the ancient witch doctors. His views on 'poetic diction', too, though soundness itself, recommend themselves by their formulation: a word or phrase is ready for use in poetry when it is universally adopted, and can be used in ordinary speech without any apologetic accentuation, or in a literary review without italics, inverted commas or capital letters. The reader was intensely interested to learn that classicist poetry, 'which is social rather than personal, and proudly divorced from the hit-and-miss methods of the dream, yet feels the need of this easy suggestion to the audience for ideal thinking; and finds it necessary to avoid realism by borrowing shreds of accredited metamorphic diction and legend, and building with them an illusion of real metamorphism. So the Hermit Crab, and once it has taken up a cast-off shell to cover its nakedness, it becomes a very terror among the whelks . . .' Whether Robert Graves gave us real words of wisdom, or only personal convictions, did not matter. One was grateful for what was given and glad to be allowed authentic glimpses of the poet's workshop. 'On English Poetry' is more than a book, it is an invaluable document and should have a place in every well-stocked library.

¹⁾ 'We may take an analogy from the wilder sort of music where if there is continual changing of time and key, the listener often does not "catch on" to each new idiom, so that he is momentarily confused by the changes and the unity of the whole musical form is thereby broken for him. So exactly in prose poetry. In poetry proper our delight is in the emotional variations from a clearly indicated norm of rhythm and sound-texture, but in prose poetry there is no recognizable norm.' (p. 14.)

I cannot say the same thing about its sequel, 'Poetic Unreason', which is too full of Freudian theory to be accepted as the sincere, unsophisticated product of Robert Graves's mind. Of course it is not valueless, parts of it, in fact, 'are excellent.' But apart from Freud & Co., what to say of heavy joking like this: 'Though a scientifically incontrovertible record were to be discovered of Shakespeare the actor's authorship of the plays ascribed to him, this would not in any way discredit or disprove the Baconian theorists, *for this reason that the record is not yet discovered . . .*' (my italics).

Zaandam.

W. VAN DOORN.

English Synonyms and Homonyms. By J. H. A. GÜNTHER. Revised by H. G. DE MAAR. Fifth Edition. J. B. Wolters. 1928. 407 p.p. Cloth f 5.40.

About the value of books on synonyms for students of language there is no communis opinio. And even if one agrees that they are useful there is the further question whether they should not rather be written by natives, in the case of living languages, than by foreigners. For ourselves, we will only say that a book on the subject is necessarily of very restricted value, but still of value, chiefly to the advanced student. The numerous English books, some of which are mentioned in the bibliography to be found in this work, may be good or bad: we have never seen or at least studied them. But we have occasionally looked up a word in Günther's book to consult the quotations he had collected with admirable industry, and with some insight into what was wanted, and we think that such a practice of occasional reference is the way in which a book on Synonyms should be used. The only criticism of the old book that we should have made would have been that many of the quotations were too much cut down to be useful. A revision of the work should have supplemented this deficiency, striking out useless quotations and substituting more illustrative ones.

The present reviser has thought differently. With a curious naivety he lays bare the businesslike method of his abridgment: he has mechanically but systematically reduced the number of quotations to two for each word. It was certainly a simple solution, if abridgment was decided upon; but one wonders why abridgment has been considered necessary. The only explanation we are vouchsafed is perhaps to be found in the remark that in opposition to the author, who in one of his prefaces speaks of his 'book of reference', the reviser expects the book to be read or 'worked through'! For this purpose he has even divided the nine hundred groups of words into three 'grades'. A student of the first grade must learn the difference between *import* and *introduce*, but he must be in or at the second grade before making himself familiar with the synonyms *infectious*, *contagious*, *catching*; and he must rise to the third grade before he is initiated into the secret of *industrious*, *assiduous*, *diligent*. It is difficult to retain one's seriousness in the face of such absurdity. But we would raise the question whether any one who has given any attention to the principles of language study can recommend such a method of work; for ourselves, we are convinced that the method is pernicious.

As examples of an unsatisfactory type of illustration we will only quote the following: He was proud of his *disciple*. George Moore. — And the *Psalms*? I hope you liked them? C. Brontë. — A *tome* of the classic legal commentator lay extended outside his desk. Meredith. — The last example

is really illustrative: it illustrates the fact, which should be familiar to every beginner, that a word is only to be understood properly in a real context. And the reader who remembers that the passage in which the unfortunate *tome* occurs tells the story of a young man caught reading a flimsy paper-covered novel of a doubtful character when he is supposed by his father to be reading law, will also see how totally different is the impression the word makes in Meredith's story from the one it makes (or rather fails to make) when torn from its context. It illustrates the truth that must be repeated again and again, in opposition to those who offer short cuts to our young students: that there are no short cuts to knowledge, and that the knowledge of a foreign language can only be gained slowly, painfully, and laboriously. Read and re-read your texts, of all kinds, and wait to see what remains permanently in your minds.

After reducing Günther's 550 pages to a little more than three hundred the author has thought fit to add almost a hundred pages of homonyms (also divided into three grades). First grade: *none* and *nun*; second grade: *air*, *heir*, *ere*, *e'er*; third grade: *aisle* and *isle*. We have said enough about the grading stunt, but what can it mean that a student should be taught systematically to associate in his mind words that have no connection whatever except the purely accidental one of being identical in sound? Why should the unfortunate student who happens to get hold of this book be encouraged to connect *kernel* and *colonel*, *hair* and *hare*, and the rest? And does the compiler really teach the phonetic identity of *whole* and *hole* in order to enable the learner to understand why an Oxford orator raised the laughter of his undergraduate audience when he exclaimed: We must look upon Oxford as a whole, and what a whole it is? We prefer simpler methods.

Summing up, we fear that we must say that Günther's book by the revision that it has undergone has lost what value it once had.

The Hague.

E. KRUISINGA.

Brief Mention.

An Introduction to English Literature. By J. H. SCHUTT.
Volume I. Pp. XII + 386. J. B. Wolters, Groningen—The Hague. 1928. Paper covers, f 4.25; Cloth, f 4.90.

As stated on the title-page, this book is primarily intended for secondary schools. As such this is not the place to review it, though it may be said without exaggeration to be superior to any history of English literature, and to most anthologies, thus far published in Holland. But the reason why the book is mentioned here is that it seems an excellent introduction to the subject for advanced students of English. It contains exactly that combination of extracts, critical comment and biography that is required for a preliminary survey, before attention is concentrated on special periods and authors. Historical introductions to the several chapters bring home the truth that literature is a product of the social and political life of the period as well as of the mind of the individual. Numerous illustrations not only satisfy those curious in physiognomy, but, what is perhaps more valuable, afford glimpses of the actual documents whence our knowledge is ultimately derived. Those who use this work as the starting-point for their study of English literature will at the same time receive an object-lesson in method.

The first volume ends with Milton and the closing of the theatres in 1642; a second volume will bring the record down to modern times. The get-up of the book is a credit to publisher and printer. May it soon be completed. — R. W. Z.

Bibliography.

HISTORY; BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Life in The Middle Ages. Selected, Translated, and Annotated by G. G. COULTON. Vol. I. Religion, Folk-lore, and Superstition. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, xv. + 246 pp. Cambridge University Press. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in one volume in 1910; the present edition will contain eight volumes.

England in Shakespeare's Day. By G. B. HARRISON. Pp. XIII + 239. Methuen, 1928. 6/- net. [A review will appear.]

England in Johnson's Day. By M. D. GEORGE. Methuen, 1928. 6/- [A review will appear.]

Handbücher der Auslandskunde. Herausg. von DR. PAUL HARTIG u. DR. WILHELM SCHELLBERG. Band I: *Englandkunde*. Teil I. xv + 348 Seiten. Mit 24 Abb. Moritz Diesterweg, Frankfurt a. Main. 1928. Geb. M. 10. [A review will appear.]

The Later Court Hands in England. From the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. Illustrated from the Common Paper of the Scriveners' Company of London, the English Writing Masters, and the Public Records. By HILARY JENKINSON. $15 \times 10\frac{3}{4}$, x. + 200 pp. In the portfolio, Alphabets I-20. Plates i-xliv. Cambridge University Press. 1927. 45s. n. [A review will appear.]

English Books. 1475-1900: A Signpost for Collectors. By CHARLES J. SAWYER and F. J. HARVEY DARTON. In Two Volumes. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$. Vol. I., Caxton to Johnson. xvi. + 368 pp. Vol. II., Gray to Kipling. viii. + 423 pp. C. J. Sawyer, 42s. n.

The Elements of Book Collecting. By IOLO A. WILLIAMS. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 171 pp. Elkin Mathews and Marrot. 8s. 6d. n.

The Sources of English Literature. A Guide for Students. By ARUNDELL ESDAILE. (Sandars Lectures, 1926.) $7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$, vii + 131 pp. Cambridge University Press, 1928. 6s. n. [A review will appear.]

Shakespeare-Jahrbuch herausg. im Auftrage der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft von WOLFGANG KELLER. Band 63. (Neue Folge IV. Band). Pp. v. + 315. Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1927. Geh. M. 8.—; geb. M. 10.— [A review will appear.]

The Variant Issues of Shakespeare's Second Folio and Milton's first published English Poem. By ROBERT METCALF SMITH. (Lehigh University Publication. Vol. II., No. 3, March, 1928.) Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. 62 pp. 25 cents.

Alexander Pope: A Bibliography. By REGINALD HARVEY GRIFFITH. Volume I., Part II. Pope's Own Writings, 1735-1751. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xxxvii. + lv. + pp. 267-593 + 22 pp. Austin: University of Texas. \$ 6.

An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students. By RONALD B. MCKERROW. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xv. + 359 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1927. 18s. n. [A review will appear.]

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. VII., 1926. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by D. EVERETT and E. SEATON. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, viii. + 177 pp. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes. 1927. 6s. n. [A review will appear.]

The Year's Work in English Studies. Vol. VII. 1926. Edited for the English Association by F. S. BOAS and C. H. HERFORD. 9×6 , 321 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 1928. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Catalogue of the Museum and Library of the Brontë Society. Compiled by J. ALEX SYMINGTON. $8\frac{1}{2} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, 200 pp. Haworth: The Library — J. Alex Symington (The Grove, Newlay Wood, Horsforth, near Leeds). 1s. 10d. post paid.

Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature. (Samuel Halkett and John Laing). By DR. JAMES KENNEDY, W. A. SMITH, and A. F. JOHNSON. New and enlarged edition. $10\frac{3}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{2}$. Vol. III. 412 pp. Vol IV. 463 pp. Oliver and Boyd. 36s. n. each vol.

The Student's Guide to the Libraries of London. With an account of the most important archives and other aids to study. By REGINALD ARTHUR RYE. Third edition, revised and enlarged. With forewords by DR. T. FRANKLIN SIBLY and SIR HENRY A. MIERS. $9\frac{1}{2} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$, xxv. + 580 pp. University of London Press. 10s. n.

The Subject Index to Periodicals, 1926. $12\frac{1}{2} \times 10\frac{1}{4}$, 555 pp. The Library Association 70s. n.

The English Catalogue of Books for 1927. Giving in one alphabet, under author and title, the size, price, month of publication, and publisher of books issued in the United Kingdom, being a continuation of the "London" and "British" catalogues; with the publications of learned and other societies and directory of publishers. (Ninety-first year of issue.) Edited by JAMES D. STEWART. Publishers' Circular. 1928. 15s. n.

PERIODICALS.

Neophilologus. XIII, 4. July 1928. H. de Groot, De geschiedenis van het Hamlet-probleem (282—293). — A. E. H. Swaen, Het Angelsaksische Raadsel 58.

De Drie Talen. 44, 6. June 1928. L. P. H. Eijkman, *Anxious, Anxiety, Anxiously.* — *Id.* 44, 7—8/9, July—Aug./Sept. 1928. L. P. H. Eijkman, *Again—Back* (97-100, 113-115; to be continued).

Revue Anglo-Américaine. V, 2. Déc. 1927. C. Cestre, *Le Tristan* d'Edwin Arlington Robinson. — L. Bonnerot, Un roman de guerre: La trilogie de la Ferme espagnole. — P. Yvon, Chesterfield et les Français. — E. Pons, Les premières éditions de Gulliver. — J. Derocquigny, Note sur Chaucer (*Canterbury Tales* B 1687, *an heep*). — *Id.* V, 3. Févr. 1928. J. J. Mayoux, L'amour dans les romans de Thomas Hardy. — C. Cestre, *Le Tristan* d'Edwin Arlington Robinson (fin). — A. Digeon, T. L. Peacock, ami de Shelley. — M. Delamare, L'évolution du féminisme à travers les âges, d'après un livre anglais récent. — H. Servajean, Une romanière de Washington: Miss Grace Denis Litchfield. — *Id.* V, 4. Avril 1928. A. Chevalley, "Monsieur" Psalmanazar. — P. Chevrillon, L'homme dans le roman marin de Conrad. — J. J. Mayoux, L'amour dans les romans de Thomas Hardy (fin). — E. Lauvrière, A propos d'Edgar Poe. — M. Clavel, Une thèse sur le roman de *Bas-de-Cuir.* — *Id.* V, 5. Juin 1928. Ch. Cestre, Franklin, homme représentatif. — J. J. Mayoux, Sur un livre de Virginia Woolf. — L. Bonnerot, Quelques notes sur l'exotisme de Stevenson. — L. Wolff, Rossetti et le moyen âge. — J. Derocquigny, Shakespeare, *King Lear*, I, 1, 199, *dear.* — Ch. Cestre, Dans les universités américaines. — *Id.* V, 6. Août 1928. Ch. Cestre, Franklin, homme représentatif (fin). — P. Baradier, La souveraineté intérieure des trade-unions devant les cours et le parlement britanniques. — A. R. Péron, La jeune poésie Irlandaise. — P. Dottin, Du nouveau sur Richardson (documents inédits).

Revue de Littérature Comparée. VII, 4 Oct.-Déc. 1927. R. Elissa-Rhaïs, Une influence anglaise dans "Manon Lescaut" ou une source du réalisme. — H. Tronchon, Renan et l'Angleterre. — H. Nidecker, Notes marginales de S. T. Coleridge (suite). En marge de Schelling. — *Id.* VIII, 1. Janv.-Mars 1928. Numéro consacré aux États-Unis. B. Fay, Franklin et Mirabeau collaborateurs. — W. M. Kozłowski, Niemcewicz en Amérique et sa correspondance inédite avec Jefferson (1797-1810). — P. Hazard, Chateaubriand et la littérature des États-Unis. — L. Roustan, Le séjour de Lenau en Amérique. — G. Chinard, La littérature française dans le sud des États-Unis, d'après le "Southern Literary Messenger" (1834-1864). — O. Guerliac, Le suicide de Prévost-Paradol à Washington et l'opinion américaine. — W. L. Schwartz, L'appel de l'Extrême-Orient dans la poésie des États-Unis. — F. Baldensperger, L'initiation américaine de Georges Clemenceau. — *Id.* VIII, 2. Avril-Juin 1928. A. Chevalley, Temps-Histoire-Roman (à propos de E. M. Forster, *Aspects of the Novel*). — S. Goulding, Le beau-père de Rivarol: Mather Flint, maître de langue anglaise à Paris. — G. Roth, Jules Verne et Byron. — *Id.* VIII, 3. Juillet-Sept. 1928. G. Fredén, A propos du théâtre anglais en Allemagne: l'auteur inconnu des *Comédies et tragédies anglaises* de 1620. — H. Nidecker, Notes marginales de S. T. Coleridge.

Revue de l'Enseignement des Langues Vivantes. 44, 6. Juin 1927. C.-M. Garnier, Emerson, annonciateur. — *Id.* 44, 8-9-10. Aout-Sept.-Oct. 1927. H. Loiseau, "Stella" et l'opinion de son temps. — H. Barthe, Notes succinctes sur les verbes causatifs anglais. — *Id.* 45, 1. Janv. 1928. P. Bonnet, L'humour de Samuel Butler, auteur d'Erewhon. — *Id.* 45, 2. Févr. 1928. *Id.*, *id.* (Fin). — *Id.* 45, 3. Mars 1928. W. Thomas, Les poèmes secondaires de John Milton et leur influence au siècle suivant. — *Id.* 45, 4-7, Avril-Juillet, 1928. G. Hauriou, Un auteur australien: Mrs. Gunn.

Les Langues Modernes. 25, 8. Nov.-Déc. 1927. F. Danchin, A propos des modifications imminentes du "Common Prayer Book". — *Id.* 26, 2. Mars 1928. F. Mossé reviews Van der Meer, *Historische Grammatik der niederländischen Sprache.* — *Id.* 26, 5. Juin 1928. F. C. Danchin, Songs of the sea.

Revue de France. 1 Aout 1927. P. Dottin, H. G. Wells dresse son bilan. — *Id.* 15 Nov. 1927. P. Dottin, Le dernier roman de J. D. Beresford.

The Taming of the Shrew.

When studying the relation between *A Shrew* and Shakespeare's *Shrew* we were struck by, and confirmed in, the idea that the generations of Shakespeare editors had not paid overmuch attention to their task. Our lately acquired conviction that *The Shrew* was young Shakespeare's caused us to look out with more than usual interest for the new *Cambridge Edition*, published last April. However, we were disillusioned and this article intends to tell why.

To begin with we may mention that we adhere to the line-numbering of *The Globe Edition*, and that our quotations from the authoritative Folio text differ from that version (a) in always printing all parts of a verse line in one line or in showing the end of a verse line by two vertical parallels; (b) in representing by spaced type the italic type of the F; (c) in indicating by italic type the words we think are interpolated; (d) in indicating by the same italic type the letters that must remain silent and are in danger of being pronounced; (e) in indicating by two dots a letter that must be pronounced; (f) in sometimes placing an accent above a stressed syllable; (g) in disregarding the parentheses of the F, but in enclosing our text additions within square brackets, and wrong text words within round brackets, and printing the supposed right word in front of the line.

After Kate and Petruchio's betrothal father Baptista epilozes :

thee fea in	Bap. Faith Gentlemen now I play a marchants part, And venture madly on a desperate Mart.	II, 1, 328
	Tra. Twas a commodity lay fretting (by you), 'Twill bring you gaine, or perifth on the (feas).	330
	Bap. The gaine I seeke, is quiet (me) the match.	
	Gre. No doubt but he hath got a quiet catch: But now Baptilta, to your yonger daughter,	
after 'fore	Now is the day we long haue lookèd (for), I am your neighbour, and was luter (firlt).	335
fore	Tra. And I am one that loue Bianca more Then words can witnesse, or your thoughts can (gueffe).	
	Gre. Yongling thou canst not loue fo deare as I.	
	Tra. Gray-beard thy loue doth freeze. Gre. But thine doth frie,	340

The misprint *me* for *in* was corrected by Rowe, and the five other corruptions within the compass of nine lines have remained as yet unnoticed notwithstanding that l. 330 is nonsense and that two or three blank verse lines between couplets are utterly suspect. As it stands in the F, l. 330 has but one meaning: Kate was a merchandise that la, wearing away in Baptista's house, but this meaning is flatly impossible: Kate was in her prime, 'yong and beautilous' (l. 2, 86), as an article of commerce her only fault was in being 'intollerable curst' (l. 2, 89). The mildest way of restoring sense is the deletion of the word *by*, then the meaning is: Kate was a commodity that lay worrying Baptista, and this meaning exactly suits Baptista's answer at l. 332. Knowing that *you* and *thee* are indiscriminately used by Shakespeare, and that they crop up as misprints and as variants in parallel texts, remembering that the addition as well as the omission of an end -s is one of the most common misprints in the primary texts, there is no reasonable doubt that Shakespeare ended II. 330/1 with *thee* and *fea*; for our emendation restores the expected rhyme and makes sense of nonsense. The

restoration of expected rhymes, *i.e.* of non-rhymes at the end of a scene or between rhyming lines, has of itself a quite sufficient claim to be generally adopted. If an editor is not convinced of this maxim, let him try in how many per cent. of the blank verse lines of, say, *Winter's Tale* he, or a poet friend of his, is able to rhyme two lines by only changing the last word of one of them and not spoiling sense or style. Chance may help him to a very few cases, so few indeed that they do not give him the right to doubt a restored rhyme which leaves the text sound or improves upon it. More we do not want to say about our emendations at ll. 335/6 and 338.

Here is a hard nut to crack:

F III, 1, 73/8:

Hypothetical reconstruction:

Gamouth I am, the ground of all accord:
Are, to plead Hortensio's passion:
Beeme, Bianca take him for thy Lord
Cfaut that loues with all affection:
Dfofre, one Cliffe, two notes haue I,
Elami, I show pittie or I die.

Gammut! I am the ground of all accord.
A) re. I come to plead Hortensio's passion.
B) mi. Bianca take him for thy Lord —
C) fa ut — that he loues you in all fashion.
D) so l re. Know, one Cliffe two notes haue I.
E) la mi. Show me pittie or I die.

The meaning of the first two syllables of the last five lines is evident; Pope helped with the least easy *Beeme*. Hanmer supplied the lost word in the last line. But there is far more to be considered. Firstly, the sequence of the notes shows that the second syllable of the first line must be a separate *ut* — *Gamouth* is the printer's spelling! — and the separation reveals a pun: gam(m)e it! Indulge in amorous play, see *N. E. D.* Secondly, *passion* and *affection* do not rhyme, *to loue with all affection* is very poor, consequently not *passion* but *affection* is the substituted word, and in its stead the genuine word must have been *fashion*, this being the only rhyme with *passion*. This is certain, but the rest of the reconstruction of this line is a guess, for the probability of which we refer to p. 88 of our *The Text of Shakespeare's Hamlet*. 'That', of course, has the meaning of *because*. Thirdly, there are gaps left in ll. 74, 76 and 77 which we have tried to fill up. And lastly, what is the meaning of l. 77 of Shakespeare's drollery? One thing is certain, the words *one Cliffe* and *two notes* cannot be taken at their face value, not two but six notes are recorded. Professor Bond in his *Arden Edition* explains: "one cleff", that of Love, limits the scale of Hortensio's efforts, his "two notes" being his dual personality as Hortensio and Licio'. If Shakespeare had written for Victorian school-girls, prone to mysticism, this explanation might be taken into consideration, but he wrote for an Elizabethan audience that, as we take it, would have wondered at a Love limiting a scale of one's efforts¹⁾, and would have been deaf to two musical sounds symbolizing a dual personality. Pope amended the sound of l. 77 by interpolating *but* before *two*. Capell, unfortunately, dozed a little when he substituted *not* for Pope's *but*; had he consulted his Right Reverend friend, that knowing scholar would have told him: *clef* has the obsolete meaning of *pin*, and *note* is an obsolete spelling for *nut*; if you do not understand my information, look up P. Levins's *Manipulus Vocabularum*, 1570, and read: 'A PIN, penis, is, hic'; with stronger arguments a lover cannot plead his case.

The quotation from Levins is highly interesting. Levins had written PIZZEL, and his printer changed this beastly word to a more human one. The case is exactly parallel with a non-rhyme, and is one of those which prove that

¹⁾ The fea hath bounds, but deepe desire hath none, — There's beggery in the loue that can be reckon'd — Was this the face that lancht a thoufand thippes?

quasi-synonymous misprints (see above II, 1, 335/6 and 338) may be deliberate printers' corrections; see our *Chapters on Engl. Printing, etc.* where at p. 14 the *pin-pizzel* case is dealt with.

In Shakespeare's *Shrew* still another rhyme is spoiled: *cunning*, the last word of the second Act, was rightly restored to *doing* by Steevens. Neither Professor Bond nor Professor Dover Wilson accept Shakespeare's playfulness.

If rhymes are spoiled by synonymous misprints or some one's arbitrariness, surely, many other words may lack genuineness. When the substituted words spoil the metre, some mystifications can be detected with convincing probability. We found two instances, in the former of which Capell rectified the line-shifting:

	Nath. Peter didst euer see the like. Peter. He kills her	
	in her owne humor. Grumio. Where is he? Cur. In her chamber,	
forbearance	making a sermon of (continencie) to her,	
cf. Cym. II, 5, 10	and railles, and sweares, and rates, that thee poore foule	IV, 1, 182/7
command	With such (auferitie) as longeth to a father.	4,7

Now-a-days it ought to be generally known that the censor and perhaps Heminge and Condell who supervised the printing of the F or at least the plays before they went to the printing-house, expunged many oaths either by deleting or by changing them. Some cases which were carelessly corrected, leaving unmetrical lines, may be spotted with sufficient probability. We give three instances, in the first of which Hanmer corrected the line-shifting:

	Bion. Where haue I beene? Nay how now, where are you?	
Maffe	(Maister), ha's my fellow Tranio stolne your cloathes,	
	or you stolne his, or both? Pray what's the newes?	I, 1, 227/30
Ods bloud	Gre. (What), this Gentleman will out-talke vs all.	2, 248
Ods wounds,	(Out) you rogue, you plucke my foote awrie,	IV, 1, 150

Of course, though a swear-word is more than probable, what precise oath at a certain line was Shakespeare's can never be determined. This is or may be a valid excuse for an editor to abstain from supplying oaths but it is no excuse for not indicating where an oath is the most probable emendation of a defective verse line.

Sometimes an arbitrary change can be detected by the words of the context. For instance,

	Gre. Beleeue me fir, they But together well.	
	Bian. [What,] Head, and but [I] an haltie witted bodie,	
	Would Iay your Head and But were head and horne.	V, 2, 39/41

In l. 40 Keightley supplied *What*, Capell's *How* was as good, and a stronger expletive is no less possible. More interesting is the fact that Bianca's words *head and but* at l. 40, repeated at l. 41, prove that the same words must have been uttered by Gremio at l. 39. Shakespeare wrote: *they head and but it well*. An emendation cannot be more certain.

Another instance of an arbitrary change we found in:

	Tra. I'faith hee'l haue a lustie Widdow now,	
	That Ishalbe woo'd, and wedded in a day.	(Iaies fo Tranio.
	Bian. God giue him ioy. Tra. I, and hee'l tame her. Bianca. He	
	Tra. Faith he is gone vnto the taming Ichoole.	IV, 2, 50/4

'He iaies fo Tranio' is impossible. The other nine syllables of this line make excellent sense, at least if we understand *an* for the ambiguous *and*, though as yet no editor has done so. Instead of the four stupefying words Bianca must have spoken a monosyllable or two syllables of which the first is stressed. *Say you?* would perfectly suit, but it is hard to see why

these words should have been changed to the words of the F. However, of *say you* there exists the monosyllabic form *say*. We met it twice in Chapman's *May-Day*, Repr. Pearson, Vol. II, pp. 337 & 344, and twice, spelled *Sa'y* in Heywood's *The Faire Maid of the West*, Repr. P., Vol. II, p. 266. A better spelling would have been *say'*. It is probable that this monosyllabic form was used by Shakespeare as well, see:

They'l pardon it. Say *you* Sir? Luc. Thy name? Imo. Fidele *Sir*.
Cym. IV, 2, 379

and, therefore, we conclude that Shakespeare wrote the monosyllabic form at l. 53, that the manager judged this expression too abrupt and changed it to *Saies he fo, Tranio?* and that the compositor unconsciously transposed the words *saies* and *he*.

To the arbitrary changes already given we add another case:

a Hath coſt me (fiue) hundred crownes ſince ſupper time. V, 2, 128

The context shows *fiue* to be wrong, and the corruption cannot easily be explained as a misprint or a printer's quasi-correction. Seemingly, we have to do with an adapter's arbitrariness who wanted more emphasis than the text allowed, see below. The case is instructive with regard to the difficulties of an editor, who has to choose the best out of seven good emendations. How have we to make the requisite change from 500 to 100? Capell proposed *a*, Rowe *an* and Collier *one* hundred. Shakespeare used *one hundred* only once at *Henry V.*, IV, 8, 88; *an hundred* occurs 10 times and *a hundred* 39 times in the basic texts. Therefore, *one* is too rare to be taken seriously into account; *a* has the best chance of being right, the more so, because we find *a hundred* 4 times in *The Shrew*, and never *an hundred*, and then, what practically decides the question, *a* in our line is correlative both to *a* at V, 2, 35 and 74. After having made the change from *fiue* to *a*, our line still seems too long and there are two unnecessary words in it, *Hath* and *me*. Pope, Capell and Collier deleted *Hath*; Singer and Lettsom deleted *me*, but Hudson proposed no further change and his view must be accepted as the best, because with the least change he restored perfect sense and perfect metre when we pronounce *me a* as *m'a*. The cases of synalœpha (*i. e.* the total eclipse of the last vowel of the first of two coalescent words, not the partial obscuration as the *N. E. D.* asserts) are everywhere in our play: *to*¹⁾ *her* I, 1, 174; *hardly*¹⁾ *indure* 178; *'atchieue* 224, etc., etc. The synalœpha of *m'a* not being expressed in print in Shakespearean texts, we adduce two instances from other writers, the manner of printing showing the pronunciation:

That can auouch m'a party in this cafe. S. Daniel, F 1623, p. 234.
Take; doe thine office. Mail. Sfoote, you make m'a hang-man:
Chapman, Rev. o. B. Repr. P. Vol. II, p. 140.

Professor J. Dover Wilson, the textual editor of the new *Cambridge Shakespeare*, in this case chose Singer's emendation; a worse choice is not possible. He thought *me* to be a misreading for *one*, because *one* for *me* occurs at I, 2, 173: 'to helpe one: to another'. If he had realized that *one...* *an-* is a clear case of a tautological misprint (*one* in Shakespeare's time was pronounced without initial *w*, and could rhyme with *man*, see III, 2, 83/6/7), he would have known that an appeal from what he considered a misreading to a tautological misprint is invalid; besides, if he had given some more

¹⁾ *o* and *y* silent.

time to it, he himself could easily have found out that *one* had no chance against *a* or even *an*.

Prof. D. W. remarks on the nature of the F text: 'Its most obvious and, to an editor, its most irritating feature is the presence of a number of lines which have been metrically ruined by the omission, or less often by the addition, of some small word or words... we have counted over forty of these metrically imperfect lines.' Let us say at once that over one hundred and forty would be nearer to the mark. Let us add that we have never felt irritated by a defect, but have quietly spent the necessary time on each case in trying to correct it, and that we have calmly enjoyed many unexpected results of our ratiocinations.

Where sense and metre are defective modern editors are willing to accept an emendation in their texts. Where the metre alone is affected, they, Prof. D. W. included, prefer to leave the text as bad as they found it; by doing nothing they think themselves wonderfully cautious and wise. Cautious and wise they may be, but they are no editors when they shrink from their task. An editor's first duty is to provide a text as pure as possible. When he knows there is a metrically defective line, he knows the text to be corrupt; when he fills up the line with a good emendation — of course within square brackets! — he knows that he has a fair chance of restoring its original purity. With this fair chance, with this possibility of hitting the mark, he and his readers must be satisfied. If he does nothing, his readers have a right to grumble, and, what is far worse, his readers are educated in the belief that Shakespeare really wrote such defective lines. In actual fact, this kind of education has gone on for two centuries.

It is quite true that, as a rule, there are several alternative ways of putting an omission right, but it is the editor's very task to search for the best. Of late years gentle readers have been imbued with the idea that since 1863 and 1864, the dates of publication of the old *Cambridge* and the *Globe Editions*, the textual critics have spoken their last words. Professor Dowden, that eminent scholar, in 1900 editing *Rom. & Jul.* for the *Arden Edition*, wrote in the first sentence of his introduction: 'I have introduced only two readings not previously found in the editions of authority', and those two (read: three!) readings consisted in the placing of one new comma and two new hyphens!! Such conservatism, though highly praised by many, really is the abnegation of editorship and an implied defence of half of the dearly beloved corruptions the primary texts contain. We do not wish to be unfair to modern editors, they all have their good points, most of them have made valuable contributions to the editor's secondary task of making obsolete words and expressions intelligible, we only doubt the desirability of reprinting the plays of Shakespeare when the obtainable gain, the correction of the *N.E.D.* and the Shakespeare Lexicons, or a new theory about this or that, could be published in a small pamphlet.

Needless to say, emendations are dangerous things, they often show the emendator's ignorance, and the best editor of to-day may be shamed to-morrow when another's or his own attention, alertness and knowledge are increased. Even time-honoured emendations, accepted by all editors, may be wrong. For instance, in the lines:

Kate. Would Katherine had neuer seen him though.
Exit weeping.

Bap. Goe girl, I cannot blame thee now to weepe,
For such an iniurie would vex a very faint,
Much more a shrew of [thy] impatient humour.

the word *thy* was introduced in 1632 by the editor (perhaps editor and compositor were the same person) of the second F, and the emendation seemed so good that every later editor adopted it. In the previous l. 28 Baptista does not specially mention that the injury is undergone by Kate, he speaks of 'such an iniurie', and in conformity with this *such* we think Shakespeare wrote *such* instead of *thy*. The expression, if need be, can be paralleled with 'Such childifh humor', *Lucr.* 1825, and our emendation is all the more probable because Kate had left the stage, not when l. 27, but when l. 29 was spoken.

At the same time the second F editor made another good emendation by deleting *very* in l. 28; he put the metre straight and left the sense almost intact. Indeed, *very* may be, and sometimes is, a manager's emphasizing insertion, but, on the other hand, Shakespeare very often used the word as it is here used, and before an editor has the right to delete such a word that may be genuine he has first to look out for a perhaps more irrelevant word. In fact, there are two quite redundant words in l. 28: *For* and *an*. If we leave them out, and keep the word *very*, we have bettered the good emendation of F 2. Why was the text changed? To take away the abruptness and to make the text more easily understandable to the audience. We must never forget that it is much harder to catch a text in the theatre than from a book. Actors know this, and compromise between the author and the audience.

Tra. What said the wench when he rofe againe?

III, 2, 168

This line was amended in F 2 to *rofe vp*, and by Steevens to *arose*. Both emendations are good, and there is not much to choose between them. However, when reading the F text we thought that Shakespeare might have written *when that*. This does not make the choice easier. In a case like this it will scarcely do to apply the maxim of the least change and decide in favour of *arose*, because the three possibilities show that the omission is due to the printer's faulty memory which produced a synonymous misprint, and then it is just as possible that he had forgotten *that* as *a-* or *up*. After having looked up the many lines where Shakespeare used *to rise*, *to arise* and *to rise up*, we are inclined to say that there is more chance that the priest rose than that he arose or rose up. All the same, our decision is rather a cutting than an untying of this instance of the many small Gordian knots which enliven the task of an editor. Even if he cannot unriddle a puzzle it must be a pleasure for him to search for the best method to approach it. That search will bear fruit to-morrow if not to-day.

When there are two or more syllables lost, the uncertainty of hitting the mark is increased twenty-fold, but not every case will be hopeless, read:

Beg. I know it well, what muft I call her? Lord. Madam.

Beg. Alce Madam, or Ione Madam [, or what elfe]?

Lord. Madam, and nothing elfe, fo Lords cal Ladies [.] Ind. 2, 110/3

Here our three inserted words restore the blank verse, are necessary for good sense, furnish a word play (Al'ce-else), and show the following line to be a perfect repartee: do we want more to become convinced of their Shakespearean genuineness?

It must not for a moment be understood that all omissions are due to a printer's slovenliness; many are deliberate quasi-corrections either by the printer, the manager (adapter), the overseers Heminge and Condell, or the censor. Let us illustrate our meaning:

Tra. Let vs intreate you ftay till after dinner.
 Pet. It may not be. Gra. Let me intreat you [to].
 Pet. It cannot be. Kat. Let me intreat you [to].

III, 2, 199/201

In these lines the metre requires *to* twice. Shakespeare's *to* is ambiguous, it may mean *to* and *too*, and when, say, the printer understands *to* and an unfinished sentence, he may easily think it much better to leave it out. Another instance:

Kate. I, if the foole could finde it where it lies.
 Pet. Who knows not where a Walpe doth weare his fting?
 ? [So,] In his taile. Kate. [So,] In his tongue (?) Pet. Whose tongue (?)
 II, 1, 213/7

Our insertions restore the blank verse, improve the dialogue, and show at the same time a plausible reason why the words were omitted. Here, say, the printer did not catch the meaning of *so*, therefore, he left it out. Unnecessary to say how much more probable a filling-up will be when the inserted word in itself possesses a probable reason for its deletion. Here is another case in point:

Kate. I pray you fir, is it your [father] will
 To make a ftaie of me amongst thefe mates?
 I, 1, 57/8

When our instinct led us to *father*, our reasoning confirmed it because the insertion perfects the rhetorical style — notice the contrast between *sir* and *father*! — and we can easily conceive that, say, the printer, not catching the non-hyphenated compound noun, made sense of the sentence according to his own light.

Oaths were deleted by the censor, or according to his instructions, and he will have deleted more than these specimens of profanity. Read these lines:

Ped. I warrant you: but fir here comes your boy,
 Twere good [that] he were fchool'd. Tra. Feare you not him: HANMER
firra Biondello, Now doe your dutie throughlie I aduife you:
 Imagine 'twere the right Vincentio (!)
 [And boldlie fweare to that.] Bion. Tut, feare not me. IV, 4, 8/13

This time we do not apologize for supplying six syllables. Our insertion makes such high fun of the dialogue that we should not have been able to hit on it if the context had not forced us into it. Small wonder that the censor did not like this schooling and deleted the offensive instruction.

The rest of the omissions of one or more words we give without comment, only respectfully mentioning the authors of the emendations which we feel bound to accept:

And when he fayes [what] hé is, fay <i>that</i> he dreames,	KEIGHTLEY	Ind. 1, 64
Bap. [Now,] Gentlemen, that I may loone make good	KEIGHTLEY	I, 1, 74
And her with-holds from me [and] Other more	CAPELL	2, 121
Gre. Oh [, oh] this learning, what a thing it is.		160
Gru. Oh [, oh] this Woodcocke, what an Alle it is		161
Gre. Beloued of me, and that my deeds fhall proue.		
Gru. [Beloued of him,] And that his bags fhall proue.		177/8
If that be all [,] Mafters (!) I heare no harme.		
Gre. No [harme], fayft mé fo, friend? What Contreyman?		189/90
Tra. Softly my Mafters: If [that] you be Gentlemen		238
Hor. Sir, let me be fo bold as afke [of] you,		251
Kate. Of all thy futors heere I charge [thee] tel	F2	II, 1, 8
.... giue vnto [you] this yong Scholler, ...	TYRWHITT	79
Holla, within. [Within there.] Sirrah, leade		
these Gentlemen To my daughters, <i>and</i> tell them both		109/10

Kate. No fuch [a] lade as you, if me you meane.	WALKER II, 1, 202
Kate. Go foole, and whom thou keep[e]st [thofe] command.	HANMER 259
Pet. [Ods wounds!] Am I not wife? Kate. Yes, keepe you warme.	267/8
Kate. Ile fee thee hang'd on londay first. Gre. <i>Hark Petruchio,</i>	
the laies thee'll fee thee hang'd [on londay] first.	301/2
If not [to you], to Signior Gremio:	399
Hort. [That is a Shrew,] But wrangling pedant, this is	³ / ₄ THEOBALD III, 1, 4
Make friends, inuite [them], and proclaime the banes,	MALONE 2, 16
....newes, and such [old] newes....	COLLIER 30
Petr. Were it [not] better I should rush in thus:	KEIGHTLEY 93
Tra. But fir, [to her] Loue concerneth vs to adde	TYRWHITT 130
As [I] before [i]mparted to your worship,	POPE 132
[How,] Signior Gremio, came you from the Church?	¹ / ₃ KEIGHTLEY 151
My houghold-Ituffe, my field, my barne, [my Itail,]	³ / ₄ CAPELL 233
Pet. Where be thefe knaues? What no man at [the] doore	CAPELL IV, 1, 123
Where are thofe [knaues]? Sit downe [my] Kate, And welcome.	144
Pet. [Ods lid!] 'Tis burnt, and fo is all the meate:	164
Hor. Would all the world but he had quite forfworn [her.]	ROWE 2, 35
Go with me [, fir,] to cloath you as becomes you.	F2 120
Gru. Why then the Muftard [pure] without the beefe.	3, 30
Lay forth the gowne. [Ods wounds!] What newes with you fir?	62
Pet. Why thou faist true, it is [a] paltrie cap,	F2 81
Whats this? a fleeue? 'tis like [a] demi cannon,	F2 88
Ped. I [, or] what elfe, and but I be deceiued,	4, 2
No worfe then I, vpon fome [due] agreement	33
Me fhall you finde readie and willing [both]	KEIGHTLEY 34
The match is made, and all is [faid and] done,	46
She will be pleas'd, then wherefore fhould I doubt [her]:	POPE 107
But foft, [what] Company is comming here [?]	STEEVENS 5, 26
Haue to my Widdow, and if the [be] froward,	F2 78
....and [is] here looking out....	LETTSOM V, 1, 32
Luc. Pardon fweete father [mine]. Vin. Lues my fweete fonne?	115
[The] right fonne to the right Vincentio,	ANON. 118
Let's each one [of vs] fend vnto his wife,	CARTWRIGHT 2, 66
Petr. I hope [a] better. Hor. Sirra Biondello,	CAPELL 85/ ¹ / ₂ , 86
Hor. I am affraid fir, doe what[ere] you can	¹ / ₂ , 88/ ¹ / ₂ , 89
Petr, [Sounds!] Worfe and worfe, the will not come: Oh vilde,	93
Say I command her come to me [forthwith].	96
Hor. I know her anfwere. Pet. What? Hor. She will not [come].	97

The total amount of the cases in this list and those separately treated (two more follow below) comes to sixty-nine omissions of one or more words. Prof. D. W.'s attitude towards these omissions is interesting. Forty-nine cases he totally ignores, he even does not signal a possible defect in the F, notwithstanding that several of these defects have been rightly amended by preceding editors. In three cases, II, 1, 110; III, 1, 4; and IV, 4, 107, he speaks about a possible omission but accepts the F text unaltered. In eleven cases he admits a good emendation in his text, and names the critics who found it; in two cases, II, 1, 79 and V, 1, 32, he admits the emendation but does not credit the right scholar with the honour. In four cases he admits another critic's wrong emendation: at III, 2, 29, see above, he is in so far excused that he did not know a better one, but in the cases at Ind. 1, 64; III, 2, 16; and 130 his judgement is at fault. At Ind. 1, 64 (the line is cited above) he accepts Johnson's conjecture *he is Sly, say* instead of the F's *he is, fay*, and he makes the similarity in spelling of *Sly* and *say* produce the omission. He risks the remark that this conjecture 'is surely as certain as most received emendations'. Alas for the certainty of emendations! — we mean to say for the certainty of Prof. D. W.'s asseverations: the Lord who speaks could not have uttered Johnson's words because his Lordship did not know *Sly* and nobody had told him the man's name!! At III, 2, 16 Malone's simple insertion of *them* gives perfect sense and

perfect metre. Against this clear simplicity Prof. D. W. has no chance with his *Make feast(s), invite friends*, for which cacophonous invention an Anonymous must be blamed, not Dyce, as Prof. D. W. has it, though Dyce adopted it. At III, 2, 130 Prof. D. W., following Grant White, inserts *to her* and deletes *sir*. There is no reason for the deletion; *to her* was often monosyllabic; we give an instance where this is shown in print:

Take heede you fall not in t'her hands againe:

Wither, *Juvenilia*, Repr. S.S. p. 59.

There are more additions to the text than there are omissions. Only a few of them are misprints or may be ascribed to the printer; some, though not all, of these misprints, we have included in our lists of other interpolations because they cannot with certainty be differentiated from those of the manager, or an experienced actor of the troupe, who adapted the play for performance. Actors do not speak a play as they get it from the author, they make it more playable, change it more or less, elucidate and smooth the text according to their own tastes and views, they add the words they want. These additions are not too hard to find when the play is written in verse; every excrescence of the normal verse line characterized by redundancy and seemingly fulfilling a theatrical desirability is an interpolation. Elsewhere, we have said more about our theory, here it may suffice to advance the bare lists of cases. We begin with the elucidating insertions:

	And not a Tinker, <i>nor</i> Christopher[o] Slie.	Ind. 2, 75
	Beg. Marrie <i>I will</i> let them play, <i>it is</i> not a Comontie.	139
	Peace <i>Tranio</i> . Tra. Well laid Mr, mum, and gaze your fill.	I, 1, 72/3
	<i>Belike</i> I knew not what to take, And what to leave?	104/5
	Some Neapolitan, or <i>meaner</i> man of Pifa.	210
	Trow you <i>wither</i> I am going? To Baptista <i>Minola</i> ,	2, 165
?	But who comes heere (.) Gre. Good morrow neighbour Báp̄tista.	
	Bap. Good morrow neighbour Gremio: <i>God laue</i> you Gentlemen.	
		II, 1, 38/41
	there is. Pet. Then shew <i>it me</i> . Kate. Had I a glasse, I would.	232/4
	And kilfe me <i>Kate</i> , wé will be married á fondáy.	326
	<i>Shall haue</i> my <i>Biancas loue</i> .	346
	Then three great Argofies, <i>besides</i> two Gallialles	380
	Hort. <i>Madam</i> , my Instrumēt's in tune. Bian. Let's heare, oh fie,	
	the treble iarres. Luc. Spit <i>in the hole</i> man, and tune againe.	III, 1, 38/40
	<i>For</i> luch an iniurie would vex a very faint,	2, 28
	hee calls for wine, a health quoth he, as if	
	he <i>had</i> beene aboard carowling to his Mates <i>after a storme</i> ,	
	quafft off the Mulcadell, and threw the fops	
	all in the Sextons face: hauing no <i>other</i> reason, but	172/6
	No, nor to morrow, not till <i>I please</i> my selfe,	WALKER 211
	For me. He not be gone till <i>I please</i> my selfe,	CAPELL 214
	Where [is] my Spaniel Troilus? <i>Sirra</i> , get you hence,	IV, 1, 153
	One Kate <i>that you must</i> kille, and be acquainted with.	155
	Is't possible <i>friend Lifio</i> , that milt[ē]ris Bianca	2, 1
	you that durst lweare <i>that your milt[ē]ris Bianca</i>	12
none (ROWE)	Lou'd (me) <i>in the World</i> so wel as Lucentio.	13
	Neuer to marrie <i>with</i> her, though she would intreate,	POPE 33
(cf. Sonn. 65, 3)	Trauaile you <i>farre</i> on, or are you at the farthest?	73
	I care not what, <i>so it be holfsome foode</i> . Gru. What lay you to a Neats	
	(foote)? 3, 16/7	
	Heere take away this diſh. Kate. <i>I pray you</i> let it stand.	44
	Kate. I thanke you sir. Hor. Signior Petruchio, fie <i>you are too</i>	
	(blame): 47/8	
	Twere good [that] he were ſchool'd. Tra. Feare you not him: <i>sirra</i>	
	(Biondello, 4, 9/10)	

¹) Cf. *The Text of the Merchant of Venice*, Neophilologus, October 1927, p. 43.

Petr. I say it is the Moone. Kate. I know it is *the Moone*. IV, 5, 16
 My name is *call'd* Vincentio, my dwelling Pifa, LETTSOM 55
 And happilie I haue arriued at *the laft* F2 V, 1, 130
 respecting you. Petr. To her *Kate*. Hor. To her *Widdow*. Petr. A hun-
 (dred marks, 2, 32/5
 Bian. I, but not frighted me, *therefore* Ile sleepe againe. 2, 43
 goe and intreate my wife to come *to me* forthwith. 1/86 1/87
 Pet. Come on I say, *and first* begin with her. Wid. She shall not. 133/4
 That seeming *to be* molt, which we indeed leaft are. COLLIER 175

Nearly all these interpolations are heedfully done but 'spit in the hole' (III, 1, 40) is a blunder. A good elucidation would have been: spit in your hands to get a faster hold. This kind of spitting as a preliminary act to an energetic trial Shakespeare humorously had in mind, and Prof. D. W. is out when he refers to A. Y. L. IV, 1, 75/6: 'verie good Orators when they are out, they will spit,' — in this case the spitting is a pretext to gain time.

Elsewhere we have shown several interpolations which are in flagrant contradiction with Shakespeare's text. Such cases, of course, at once prove the foreign hand, but it is not necessary for the *unassailable proof* of the presence of these foreign intruders that many of them are blunders, it is sufficient that by simply expurging certain redundant words *all* the abnormally long lines can be reduced to the regular length we find in Shakespeare's poems. This we show by means of our lists. If Shakespeare's blank verse had had a looser construction, if it had admitted more syllables than his heroic verse, then, surely, it would be absolutely impossible to regularize *all* the too long lines by deleting redundant words in such a way that the remaining text is metrically pure and better in a literary sense or at least as good as the text we are accustomed to.

The next group we call the smoothing interpolations, and we remark that the placing of insertions in groups is somewhat arbitrary; elucidating, smoothing and even acting-suiting purposes do not sharply differ:

refolu'd Beg. Well, we'l fee't: Come Madam wife fit by my lide, Ind. 2, 145/6
 Bap. *Gentlemen* content ye: I am (relould): Go in Bianca. I, 1, 90/1
 Tra. So had you neede: *In breefe* Sir, fith it your pleasure is, CAPELL 215/6
 Hearke you *fir*, Ile haue them verie fairely bound, HANMER 2, 146
 Ile mend it with a Largeffe. Take your paper *too*, HANMER 151
 Gre. Oh fir, fuch a life with fuch a wife, were ftrange: WALKER 194
 Her affability and balhfull modestie: II, 1, 49
 these Gentlemen To my daughters, *and* tell them both 110
 Bap. Now Signior Petruchio, how fpeed you with my daughter? Pet. How but well fir? how but well? HANMER 283/4
 Pet. Be patient *gentlemen*, I choofe her for my felfe, 304
 Bap. I know not what to fay, *but* giue me your hands, 320
 Bap. *Well gentlemen*, I am thus refolu'd, On foday next, you know 394/5
 Bian. (THEOBALD) (Hort.) I mult beleuee my mafter, elfe I promife you, III, 1, 54
 Pet. *Come*, where be thefe gallants? Who's at home? Bap. *You*
 (are welcome *fir*)
 Petr. And yet I come not well. Bap. And yet you halt not. 2, 89/91 1/2
 Lucentio, you *fhall* fupply the Bridegroomes place, POPE 251
 Bap. She fhall Lucentio: *come* gentlemen lets goe. POPE 254
 Tra. *Wel fir*, to do you *courtesie*, (cf. II. 103 & 111) IV, 2, 91
 A cultard coffen, a bauble, a filken pie, 3, 82
 pupp (?) Tail. *She faies* your Worship meanes to make a (puppet) of her. 105
 Sir, this is the gentleman I told you of, 4, 20
 Hor. *Well* Petruchio, this has put mé in heart; 5, 77
 Petr. *You* are verie fencible, *and* yet you miffe my sence: V, 2, 18
 is that an anfwere? Gre. I, *and* a kinde one too: 83

The third group contains the acting-suiting interpolations, and includes the emphasizing insertions of which there are two exemplary specimens in one line we will first cite:

And yet Ile promise thee she shall be rich, And verie rich: but th'art <i>too much</i> my friend, And Ile not with thee	(to her. I, 2, 62/4)
<i>Huntf. I will my Lord.</i>	Ind. 1, 30
<i>Players. We thanke your Honor.</i>	80
<i>Gre. And me too, good Lord.</i>	I, 1, 67
Kate. Why, and I' truft I' may go too, may I not?	102
I knew not what to take, And what to leaue? <i>Ha.</i>	105
Luc. <i>Tranio let's go:</i>	250
<i>Petruchio stand by a while.</i>	2, 143
Petru. Peace <i>sirra</i> . Hor. Grumio mum: God saue you signior	(Gremio. 162/3)
Gre. <i>So said, so done, is well:</i>	186
Grem. <i>Hortensio hearke:</i>	212
Kate. There is, <i>there is</i> . Pet. Then shew it me. Kate. Had I a glasse,	(I would. II, 1, 232/4)
Pet. <i>What</i> , you meane my face. Kate. Well aym'd of such a yong	(one. 235/6)
Gre. <i>Hark...</i>	(see omissions)
<i>Sirra</i> , young gamester, your father were a foole	302
<i>harke, harke, I heare the minstrels play.</i> Muficke playes. III, 2, 185	402
Kate. <i>Nay, then,</i>	209
Luc. <i>Sir</i> , to satisfie you in what I haue said, POPE	IV, 2, 4
Tra. Oh depightful Loue, vnconstant womankind, WARBURTON	14
Luc. <i>And what of him Tranio?</i>	66
Bion. As much as an apple doth an oyfter, & all one.	101
<i>Go get thee gone, I say.</i>	3, 35
Pet. Oh monstrous arrogance: Thou lyest, thou thred, thou thimble.	106
Ped. <i>Soft son:</i>	4, 23
Bap. <i>I follow you.</i>	72
Gre. Here's packing with a witnesse to deceiue vs <i>all</i> . HANMER V, 1, 122	
Wid. Thus I conceiue by him. Petr. Conceiues by me, <i>how likes</i>	(<i>Hortensio that?</i> 2, 22/3)
And now you know my meaning. Kate. A' <i>verie</i> meane meaning.	31
<i>You are welcome all.</i>	48
Hort. Content, what [i]s the wager? Luc. Twentie crownes.	
Petr. <i>Twentie crownes</i> , Ile venture so much of my Hawke or Hound, 70/2	
How now, what newes? Bio. <i>Sir</i> , my Miltris sends you word	80
Pet. Oh ho, intreate her, <i>nay</i> then thee must needes come. $\frac{1}{2}$ 87/ $\frac{1}{2}$ 88	
Yours will not be entreated: <i>Now</i> , where's my wife?	$\frac{1}{2}$ 89/90

Whereas we count about a hundred cases of supernumerary words or expressions, Prof. D. W. accepts only nine cases. Following F2, Rowe, Collier and F 2, he rightly deletes the misprints *is* in I, 2, 73; *to* in 154; *but* in IV, 2, 86; and *the* in V, 1, 130. The first three misprints are not included in our lists. Following F 2, he deletes *my* in II, 1, 346, and this means that he metrically improves an interpolation. Following Capell, he wrongly deletes *Oh* in I, 2, 194 instead of the tautological misprint *a*. He deletes *very* in III, 2, 28, and calls it 'an obvious interpolation', see above. He deletes *five* in V, 1, 128, see above. And lastly, wholly on his own account, he deletes *not* in III, 2, 211, see above. We do not think the word can be missed. If he had looked up Shakespeare's use of *please*, he would have found

And may direct his courie as pleafe himselfe Rich. 3. II, 2, 129

and he would have known that Walker's emendation of l. 211 and Capell's of l. 214 were right. *Please* is the short form of *it pleases*.

Now we have seen that Prof. D. W. accepted 17 omissions found by other scholars, and following their filling-up, did this 13 times rightly and 4 times wrongly. He recognized 9 additions of words, four rightly, and five wrongly. That he did not accept some 50 omissions and some 100 insertions more, all conservative scholars, who like to conserve the defects of the basic texts, will extol. But one thing nobody can praise. Prof. D. W. tells us that he had counted over 40 lines, metrically ruined by the omission or the addition of small words. Where are they all? In his text and his notes we could only find 26 cases. Where are the 15, or more, other ones? It is a serious question because he calls the plentiful occurrence of these faults the most obvious feature of the F text, and his *Shrew* is 'EDITED FOR THE SYNDICS OF THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS'.

Not one editor wholly abstains from restoring verse lines which are only metrically bad. For instance, out of the 17 cases wherein Prof. D. W. admitted missing words not less than seven only rectify the metre. We fear that the modern editors' quasi-principled reticence may not be valued more highly than as a welcome excuse for failing in duty. At the back of the question lurks their ignorance of the structure of the verse line. Early editors have done much valuable work in restoring verse lines, late editors have added nothing and discarded much good work. Let us review what the latest editor makes of the prose patches in the F which ought to have been printed as verse. Prof. D. W., following other editors, rightly restores: Ind. 1, 32/3 ROWE; I, 1, 227/30 HANMER; 244/9 CAPELL; 2, 34/5 ROWE; II, 1, 42/3 CAPELL; 74/5 ROWE; 214/7 ROWE; III, 2, 83/8 COLLIER; 169/73 F 2; 177/85 STEEVENS; IV, 1, 187/90 POPE; V, 1, 166/8 CAPELL; 2, 82/3 ROWE; and 130/1 ROWE. In not less than eight of these he forgets to name the restorer; it looks as if we have to credit Prof. D. W. with the honour. Sometimes he forgets to mention the state of the F. Of course, all this is only carelessness. Even when he quotes from the F, he is often negligent: in his notes to the first Act we found *achiefe* for *atcheeue* I, 1, 184; *weighty* for *waighty* 253; *gentlewoman* for *Gentlewoman* 2, 87; *upon* for *vpon* 110; *disguised* for *disgufed* 140; and *love* for *Loue* 142.

Three prose patches Prof. D. W. keeps as prose. Our restoration of II, 1, 38/41 and Capell's of IV, 1, 182/6 are quoted above. The other case, also Capell's, concerns the first two lines of this quotation:

Beg. Marrie *I will* let them play, *it is* not a Comontie,
a Chrltmas gambold, or a tumbling tricke?

Lady. No my good Lord, it is more pleaing ftuffe.

? Beg. What, houhold ftuffe (.) Lady. It is a kinde of history [.]

Beg. Well, we'l lee't: Come Madam wife fit by my fide,
And let the wórl'd flip, wé shall nere be yonger[.] Ind. 2. 139/47

We have cited this whole passage because we think it our painful duty to state that Prof. D. W., following Pope, renders the last two lines as prose, and, much more important, changes *Comontie*, Sly's joking blunder for *comedy* (often spelled *comodie*), into *commodity*. This is one of the worst attempts at emendation we are acquainted with: *commonty* and *comédie* have some likeness of sound, *commódi*ty and *cómedy* not even to Sly's coarse ears. Prof. D. W. thinks that *A Shrew* supports his alteration; in that play, indeed, the corruption *commodity* occurs, but that whole play is a corruption, see our article in the last August number of this periodical.

The prose of the F at III, 2, 174/6 is differently arranged by F 2 and Steevens; Prof. D. W. follows Steevens, without mentioning him, but both changes are wrong, see our restoration in our list of elucidating insertions.

All modern editors, following Rowe and Capell, and Prof. D. W. without mentioning his seducers, have made a mess of the lines V, 2, 85/90. Even the F was better, see our lists.

Prof. D. W. rightly follows Pope by making prose of the F verse form at II, 1, 76/88, but wrongly follows Pope at Ind. 2, 143/7, see above, and at

Luc. Tranio let's go:
One thing more refts, that thy selfe execute,
To make one among these wooers: if thou ask me why,
Sufficeth my reasons are both good and waightly. I, 1, 250/3

Here, the F is good: the first line is the acting-suiting insertion for leaving the stage; the next line is Lucentio's usual blank verse, which he follows up with two lines of rhymed doggerel (archaic accentuation of *waightly*, cf. *fondáy* at II, 1, 326), nicely in agreement with Tranio's doggerel and the lower state to which he submits himself.

Near allied to the printing of prose for verse and verse for prose is the line-shifting. Prof. D. W. restores the cases at I, 1, 59/60 POPE; II, 1, 219/20 POPE; IV, 4, 62/3 POPE; and V, 2, 93/4 STEEVENS, without naming the benefactors whose inventions he copies; at II, 1, 219/20 without stating the fault of the F; but he utterly ignores the perfect restorations of Malone at Ind. 1, 77/8; of Capell at Ind. 2, 102/4; of Capell at II, 1, 222/6; of Hanmer at II, 1, 283/4; of Capell at IV, 1, 144/5; and he left to us the restorations at II, 2, 301/2, see above; at III, 1, 38/40, see above; at IV, 1, 125/7:

Where is Nathaniel, Gregory, Phillip. All fer. Heere,
heere fir, heere fir. Pet. Heere fir, heere fir, heere fir, *heere fir*.

Here there is only the difficulty of a tautological misprint, but the next and last case is somewhat harder:

And now you know my meaning. Kate. A' *verie* meane meaning.
Wid. Right, I meane you. Kat. And I am meane indeede,
respecting you. Pet. To her *Kate*. Hor. To her *Widdow*. Petr. A
(hundred marks,
my Kate does put her down. Hor. That [i]s my office [.] V, 2, 30/6

An editor who cannot find the common transposition misprints is a poor artist. Whoever sees 'refould' at I, 1, 90 in the F can emend it to *resolv'd*, but when words are transposed most editors seem to be blind. Only Pope corrected the line I, 2, 255 by transposing *is* after *th' other*, and Capell altered

Luc. Quicke proceeders marry, now tell me I pray, IV, 2, 11

by placing monosyllabic *marry* at the head, and *now* after *me*. The first correction was palmary, the second change was unnecessary, and therefore wrong; Capell forgot that in this line *me*, not *tell*, must be stressed. The as yet undetected instances follow in their corrected forms; the first correction is only necessary for the sense, the others are only necessary for the metre:

Kat. I for a buzzard, as he takes a Turtle.	II, 1, 209 ¹⁾
Beg. They lay that I haue dream[è]d, Madame wife,	Ind. 2, 114
Ba p. Importune me no farther, Gentlemen,	I, 1, 48
Pet. My bufinesse asketh halte, Signior Baptista,	II, 1, 115
Provide the fealt, and father bid the guefts,	318
Come fir, in Pifa we will better it.	IV, 4, 71
Hor. Who fhall begin? Luc. That will I. Biondello,	
Goe bid your Miftris come to me. Bio. I goe.	V, 2 75/7
Goe to your Miftris, Sirra Grumio,	95

¹⁾ Prof. D. W. following up a guess of the *N.E.D.*, without mentioning the *N.E.D.*, explains the F text by assuming the buzzard to be a cockchafer: 'as the turtle-dove swallows the cockchafer'. Unfortunately, the turtle-dove does not take cockchafers.

However, some of the transposed appellations, though they may be unconscious compositor's faults, look very much like the arbitrary changes of someone who thought, if you speak to a character on the stage, you begin by calling him by his name.

To some undetected synonymous misprints, already given at the beginning of this article, we add *speeding* for *speed* II, 1, 303, cf. II, 1, 139.

If we have not made a mistake we have counted 30 cases of tautological misprints of which 'a a kinde' at Ind. 2, 144, and 'weee'le' at V, 2, 184 are not recorded in the old *Cambridge Edition*, whose degree of accurateness surpasses the new *Cambridge Edition* to a vast extent. We can give six new corrections of these misprints; four, at II, 1, 232; IV, 1, 127; 2, 12; and 3, 82, are included in our lists; the fifth concerns *for* at I, 1, 3: it seems to be a repetition from I. I, 1, 1 and we take *by* (= in passing over) to be the right word; the sixth is obvious:

him

Wil hé woo hér ? I: or I [wi]ll hang (her).

I, 2, 198

We have no space for dealing with the other tautological misprints but we should like to legitimate Collier's excellent emendation at I, 1, 42, accepted only by Dyce: *now were* for *thou wert*. The wrong *thou* for *now* is the repetition of *thou* in the preceding line, *wert* for *were* is a secondary, perhaps unconscious, quasi-correction. On the other hand, Prof. D. W.'s *Broach....brach* at Ind. 1, 17/8 for *Brach... brach* we have to reject. If it was a tautological misprint the second word would be wrong. Here the F words are good, only the punctuation is defective. Read I. 17 in parentheses, and put a comma after *cur*; Grant White taught us this. Prof. D. W. says 'The F. reading is impossible, because (i) it leaves the sentence without a verb, and (ii) it involves an ugly repetition with "brach"'. Both because we challenge. The verb *is* is there, and then, is it an ugly repetition of the word *drunkard* if we speak in one sentence of the drunkard Sly and the drunkard with the roaring voice? In this broach-case and in several unacceptable emendations of Prof. D. W. it is his wrong method of sticking ever and anon to the doctrine of the *ductus literarum* which leads him astray (see our article in the August number 1925 of this periodical), and his wrong method is exaggerated by the unchecked publication of his flashes of imagination. How improbable, not to say ridiculous, is it to assume that exhausted dogs were bled in Elizabethan times! Yet, in good earnest, we can praise Prof. D. W. for having had the idea of *broach*, but we think it a great mistake to publish such an idea without some proof or indicative fact that blood-letting was a known cure for exhausted dogs.

Reading the beginning of the first Act in the F we halt at ll. 11 and 13, and we wonder why Shakespeare did not tell us that Vincentio was the name of Lucentio's father. The audience wants this bit of information. In all modern editions the halting at l. 13 is somewhat cured and the information is to some extent given by changes of punctuation and the deleting of an 's'; but these changes contort the text badly, and surely, an audience cannot catch it. We think the F words and the punctuation of ll. 12-14 are good, but a slight omission and the omission of a whole line cause the bad text. A surrogate will explain our meaning:

his,

Pifa renownēd for graue Citizens
Gae me my being, and my father (firſt)
A Merchant of great Traffick through the world:
[My father's name is cald Vincentiō.]

I, 1, 10

12

Vincentiô's come ôf the Bentiuolij,
 [And to] Vincentio's sonne, brough[t] vp in Florence,
 It shall become to ferue all hopes conceiu'd
 To decke his fortune with his vertuous deedes:

I, 1, 13

16

After having said *en passant* that the strange word in Sly's 'let the world flide: Sella' (Ind. 1, 6) means *that's it*, we think we have sufficiently proved that the generations of editors of *The Shrew* have not paid much attention to their task, and that Prof. D. W.'s edition, with regard to the purification of the text, is no improvement at all. *C'est ça!*

Two primary questions remain: from what MS. was the F text printed, and who was the author?

The actors' names in the speech-headings, Sincklo and others, prove that the text was printed from a prompt-book or from a transcript of it, and a prompt-book may be the author's autograph, adapted for the stage. Heminge and Condell tell us that Shakespeare's MSS. were cleanly written, which made them, without transcription, fit for the intended use. One would say, when there are no special and weighty reasons against it, we have to assume printing from the adapted autographs, and this is what the publishers of the F state: 'Published according to the True Originall Copies'. That sundry plays in the F are reprints of Quartos does not invalidate their statement because, in those days of inexactness, they considered a reprint to be the same thing as a first edition: otherwise, they would not, for instance, have printed the F text of *Rich. II.* from the fifth Quarto of that play.

Prof. D. W. argues that the F text of *The Shrew* was printed from a transcript. His reasoning might have been clearer but, as far as we understand his main argument, it comes to this that the elaborate stage-directions remind him of those in *Errors* which he thinks to have been written by another hand than the dialogue. Besides, he finds indications of editorial interference with the speech-headings, and, when there are two hands in the play, he concludes that the MS. cannot be Shakespeare's holograph but that there must have been an intermediate transcript, probably from dictation on account of six 'errors of the ear'. These quasi-errors of the ear (there are only five) are the usual homonymous misprints which certainly do not prove dictation; however, for the moment this question is irrelevant. What Prof. D. W. has cleverly observed with regard to the stage-directions is quite true, and we heartily subscribe to his interpretation of a second hand, only this does not prove a transcription. Our standpoint is that an author's MS. had been already adapted for stage-use before it went to the censor, who also ordered changes and deleted what he did not like. This means that in all printed plays of the time there may be expected the traces of three hands, of the author (either from autograph or transcript), of the manager-adapter, and of the censor; consequently, the traces of these different hands are no evidence against printing from the author's autograph.

Broadly speaking the scribe and the printer make exactly the same mistakes, and though a bad compositor will make more mistakes than a good scribe plus a good compositor, yet an extraordinary amount of slight mistakes makes an intermediate link between autograph and printed play probable. In this respect a great number of wrong letters does not mean anything, but two good tests are the number of omissions and the number of tautological misprints. With a modest claim to exactness we can provide the following statistics which show the increased faultiness of two different reprints from the same original:

	Merchant Q Heyes	Q Roberts	F	Shrew F
Lines	2614	2613	2615	2649
Omissions	14	34	31	69
Taut. misprints	18	27	25	30

The Shrew heads the lists and the numbers given strongly point to its having been printed from a transcript. The Heyes *Merchant*, we are convinced, was printed from Shakespeare's adapted autograph, and so is *Hamlet's* Q 1604 in which version we counted 60 omissions and 24 tautological misprints, but taking into account the number of lines, namely 3691; the comparison with *The Shrew* leads to the same conclusion. Of one more play we can give these numbers: *Richard II.*, Q 1 has 2537 lines with 46 omissions and 29 tautological misprints. We also think this text to have been printed from Shakespeare's autograph. Here the comparison seems less convincing, but *Richard II.* is wholly in verse, and in a verse text nearly all omissions can be found. *The Shrew* contains some 500 prose lines, and in prose fewer of the tautological misprints and far fewer of the omissions can be detected. Therefore, the comparison of these numbers with those of *The Shrew* also confirms the great probability that the play was printed from a transcript. Besides, it is not at all improbable that the prompt-book of *The Shrew* had to be transcribed; a use of some thirty years of the same copy seems rather a long time. So that, after all, we are glad to agree with Prof. D. W.'s assumption of a transcript from which the F text was printed.

In the new *Cambridge Shakespeare* we meet with the remarkable fact that the two editors disagree about the authorship of the play. For them St. Mark III, 24 was written in vain. Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch ably pleads for a wholly genuine Shakespeare text, Prof. D. W. gives his reasons why he believes in *Mäusedreck* und *Koriander*. As we whole-heartedly side with Sir Arthur we will review Prof. D. W.'s arguments only in so far as they are not met by his co-editor, who happily deals with the die-hard doctrine that trivial passages or lines, disgusting to us, could not have been written by Shakespeare. However, it must be said in Prof. D. W.'s honour, in this respect his arguments are modest and limited to IV, 2, 15/20; fortunately, he did not understand III, 1, 73/8.

Prof. D. W. maintains that Shakespeare's play-writing consisted in revisions of old plays and re-revisions of his own revisions. *The Shrew*, he thinks, is a revision of an old play, possibly written by Nashe, and containing many unrevised passages. His arguments are: (i) the unsatisfactory state of the text, doggerel, mixture of verse and prose, bad line-arrangements, broken lines, etc., suggest to him revising and rewriting. To us they suggest manager's meddling and printer's carelessness. Shakespeare's doggerel and alternate prose and verse, we suppose, are deliberate stylistic contrasts by which he often happily and effectively elucidates to the audience the individuality of his characters and their changes of moods. (ii) Prof. D. W. suspects and finds 'it hard to withstand the suspicion' that some of the prose clown-dialogue was from the hand of Nashe; his reasons are (a) the compound noun 'Aglet babie' at I, 2, 79 is not found elsewhere in Shakespeare, but Nashe uses *aglet* twice; (b) 'Nit' at IV, 3, 110 is found elsewhere only once in *L.L.L.*, but it is a favourite word with Nashe; (c) 'Apart from other things [not mentioned], the prose-rhythm [of III, 2, 43/64 and a passage cited from Nashe] seems very similar'. It seems very unnecessary, but if need be, we refer to our criticism of this kind of argument in the preceding

August number of this periodical¹⁾. (iii) I, 1, 159 'is unlike Shakespeare, but quite in the vein of Marlowe who with Nashe wrote the *Tragedie of Dido*'; the same applies to I, 1, 173/5. Are we to understand that Marlowe too had a hand in the old play Shakespeare revised? Or may we hope Prof. D. W. simply means that Marlowe's style exerted some influence upon young Shakespeare? (iiii) Prof. D. W. finds some faults with the plot: (a) in the first Act Hortensio takes the centre of the stage as suitor to Bianca and as Petruchio's friend, but drops out afterwards, and Tranio steps into his shoes as Petruchio's friend; (b) Tranio interprets some of Petruchio's intentions by divination; (c) by divination Petruchio tells Vincentio all about his son's betrothal to Bianca. All these remarkable features suggest to Prof. D. W. an old play which would have told us more and better how things came to pass, but its information was deleted by Shakespeare. We do not hold Hortensio to be the leading character in the first Act; in the first scene it is Lucentio, and in the second it is Petruchio. But this does not matter much; it is of more importance that many scholars have taught us that some of Shakespeare's faults must be explained as faults of the model he followed. From Shakespeare's faults to conclude he followed a good model, and to explain Shakespeare's faults as deliberate aberrations from that imagined goodness, this news *ex cathedra* we beg leave to doubt. For goodness' sake, here is the end of all!

The Hague.

B. A. P. VAN DAM.

Notes and News.

De Examens voor de Vreemde Talen. Van verschillende zijden is ons verzocht enige nadere toelichting te geven bij het K. B. van 30 Mei j.l., aangaande het programma van de examens M.O. Frans, Duits en Engels.²⁾ Wij willen in het volgende trachten aan deze verzoeken te voldoen.

De nieuwe examenregeling, of juist, de toevoeging aan het examen-program, betreft zowel de A- als de B-examens. Bij het A-examen kan een opstel worden gegeven en een vertaling uit de vreemde taal naast de van ouds voorgeschreven en ook nu gehandhaafde vertaling uit de moedertaal. De commissie kan echter ook of opstel of vertaling uit de vreemde taal laten vallen, en zich dus tot twee schriftelijke opgaven beperken. Bij het B-examen moet een vertaling uit de vreemde taal, en een uit de moedertaal worden gemaakt.

Als men er prijs op stelt ons oordeel te vernemen, willen wij beginnen met te verklaren dat de verandering een verbetering kan zijn: dat hangt van de commissies af, en niet van het departement dat het besluit uitvaardigde. Een vertaling uit de vreemde taal eist van de kandidaat een kennis van het Nederlands zoals men bij een leraar wenselijk en nodig mag achten. Het opstel kan nuttig zijn om de werkelijke taalbeheersing te controleren; het is dus meer een aanvulling van het mondelinge examen met zijn onvermijdelijke gebreken dan een middel om de algemene geschiktheid te beoordelen.

¹⁾ We take this opportunity to correct a misrepresentation of Mr. Sykes's view with regard to the authorship of *A Shrew*. Mr. Sykes does not assert that the whole of that play was written by Rowley, as must be inferred from a slip in our exposition, but he maintains that Rowley is the author of the prose part of *A Shrew*.

²⁾ Zie het Augustus-nummer van E. S., bl. 120.

Maar hiermede zijn we nog niet doorgedrongen tot de kern van de zaak: een goed examen is van minder belang dan een goede opleiding. Wij moeten dus de vraag beantwoorden of het examen ertoe zal bijdragen het aan toekomstige leraren gegeven onderwijs in betere banen te leiden. Daar gaat het feitelijk om, en op die vraag zijn we optimistisch genoeg om met ja te antwoorden. In de eerste plaats zal er meer variatie zijn in de schriftelijke oefeningen. De vertaling uit de vreemde taal kan bij goede leiding er slechts toe bijdragen dat de studie degelijker en veelzijdiger wordt. Dit laatste is hoogst noodzakelijk voor de a.s. leraar, en de lektuur van A-kandidaten is totnutoe soms bedroevend eenzijdig en onbeduidend. In meer dan één examenverslag van de laatste jaren heeft de Engelse A-kommissie de kandidaten met nadruk gewezen op de wenselijkheid om de lektuur niet te beperken tot wat men belletrie gelieft te noemen, ofschoon het dat zeker lang niet altijd is, maar zich ook door boeken over geschiedenis en staatsinstellingen op de hoogte te stellen van het Engelse maatschappelijk leven. De kommissie krijgt door de vertaling uit het Engels gelegenheid te tonen, dat de raad in die verslagen gegeven ernst is geweest, en zal dat kunnen doen door ook stukken van deze soort aan kandidaten voor te leggen. Het ligt voor de hand dat de B-kandidaten, vooral diegenen die het nu ingestelde A-examen hebben afgelegd, ook wel kunnen worden gevraagd een vertaling te leveren van een literaire kritiek, maar ook voor dezen is een stuk van historische of in het algemeen van wetenschappelijke aard even geschikt als voor de A-kandidaten, behalve dan dat men bij de B-examens niet zo beperkt is in zijn keus: de B-kandidaat immers behoort elk niet-technies stuk te kunnen vertalen indien het vertaalbaar is.

Wat het opstel betreft, men kan natuurlijk een vertel-opstel geven, zoals een leraar in het Nederlands in de lagere klassen gewoonlijk zal doen. Maar daarnaas is ook mogelijk een opstel dat tevens enige eisen stelt aan het denkvermogen van de leerling, en hem dwingt tot een behoorlijke dispositie. Het zal nuttig en nodig zijn dat de leerling geoefend wordt in het maken van zulke stofverdeling, en die boven zijn opstel plaatst, zodat de dosent kan beoordelen of hij zich aan zijn dispositie heeft gehouden. Natuurlijk is het ook mogelijk dat de kommissie een stof voor het opstel aangeeft in de vorm van een schema, of iets anders van die aard: niemand weet hoe het programma zal worden uitgevoerd, daar er nog geen kommissie is, en er geen ervaring bestaat. Maar wie enige opstellen van verschillende soort onder behoorlijke leiding maakt (hoogstens acht, zouden wij zeggen, in één jaar), kan zich voor dit gedeelte redelijk voorbereid achten. Hoofdzaak is en blijft dat men nauwkeurig leest; aan die noodzakelijkheid ontkomt niemand, en ieder die daarvoor plaatsvervangende middeltjes aanbiedt (woordenlijstjes, synoniemboekjes, e.d.) is een gevaar voor de kandidaten.

Misschien zal deze of gene lezer zeggen dat het er voor de opleiders niet gemakkelijker op wordt: dat is volkomen juist. Maar het examen is er voor de school, en niet voor de opleiders. Het zal misschien meer en meer nodig worden de privaattlessen te vervangen door een opleiding die meer in overeenstemming is met het gewicht van de leraarstaak. Wij zijn van mening dat de taak van de middelbare leraar niet minder gewichtig is dan die van andere intellektuele beroepen: die van dokter, ingenieur, predikant. Ten slotte zal zelfs een onverschillige regering, en een onverschillig publiek dat gaan begrijpen. Ook bij de artsen heeft men de periode van privaatopleiding gekend, en bij de opleiding tot notaris is men misschien niet heel veel verder dan bij het middelbaar onderwijs. De aktie, ingezet door de Vereniging van Leraren in Levende Talen, is, blijkens een bericht in het

Weekblad voor Gymnasiaal- en Middelbaar Onderwijs, gevolgd door een besluit van de A. V. M. O. om het onderwerp van de leraarsopleiding ter hand te nemen. Er is dus hoop dat er te eniger tijd iets zal gebeuren. Voorlopig mogen we dankbaar zijn dat het Ministerie een maatregel heeft genomen die een goede invloed kan oefenen op een deel van de leraarsopleiding.

Leerstoelen voor de Moderne Talen aan alle Universiteiten? In ons nummer van Junie 1927 (bl. 80-81) hebben wij aan deze vraag enige opmerkingen gewijd, naar aanleiding van een passage in de rede waarmede Professor de Vooys kort te voren het Nederlandse Philologencongres had geopend.¹⁾ Wij meenden haar toen ontkennend te moeten beantwoorden. Tans, na lezing van het pleidooi van de Leidse hoogleraar Huizinga in het November nummer van de *Gids*, vinden wij generlei aanleiding om ons standpunt te herzien. Wij zouden dus kunnen volstaan met te verwijzen naar hetgeen wij verleden jaar schreven; doch waar, blijkens de toezending van een overdruk van het bedoelde artikel — „Aangeboden door de Voorzitters der letterkundige Faculteiten te Leiden en te Utrecht” — prijs gesteld wordt op ons oordeel in dezen, willen wij de kwestie hier nogmaals aan de orde stellen.

Op zichzelf is er tegen de opvatting dat een letterkundige fakulteit niet meer volledig uitgerust kan worden geacht zonder leerstoelen voor de moderne talen, weinig in te brengen. Dit gedeelte van het betoog van Prof. Huizinga zal dan ook wel geen tegenspraak ontmoeten. Het is hem echter niet te doen om een theoretiese beschouwing over de plaats der moderne philologie, doch om een stel onmiddellike praktische maatregelen, waardoor binnen enkele jaren de Universiteiten te Leiden en Utrecht van rijkswege zullen worden voorzien van professoren, lektoren en assistenten in het Frans, Duits en Engels. De konkrete bedoeling van het artikel blijkt wel hieruit dat het een uitgewerkte kostenberekening bevat, om bij voorbaat eventuele bedenkingen van het Departement van Financien te ontzenuwen.

Wij kunnen hier zowel de principiële als de financiële zijde van het vraagstuk laten rusten; onze bezwaren zijn van andere aard. Een ervan is door Prof. Huizinga zelf reeds gevoeld. Hij houdt rekening met „de praktische overweging, dat een zoo sterke vraag opeens naar Romanisten, Anglisten en Teutonisten te hooge eischen zou stellen aan de wetenschappelijke markt hier te lande”. Hij wil deze moeilijkheid ondervangen door de uitvoering van zijn plan over zes jaren te verdelen. Een lezer van de *N. R. C.* oppert de mogelijkheid om ook buitenlanders voor de nieuwe leerstoelen te benoemen. Wij betwijfelen of de letterkundige faculteiten te Leiden en Utrecht deze oplossing, anders dan in een enkel biezonder geval, als de meest gewenste zouden beschouwen. Hoe dit ook zij, na afloop van het overgangstijdperk zouden aan de gezamenlike Nederlandse Universiteiten — over de Vrije Universiteit is in dit verband nog niet gesproken — voor iedere moderne taal beschikbaar moeten zijn *vijf* professoren en *vijf* lektoren. Dat wil dus zeggen *tien* personen van erkend wetenschappelijke bekwaamheid, niet alleen in enkele onderdelen van hun studievak, doch op het gebied, hetzij der taalkunde, hetzij der letterkunde, in zijn geheel; *tien* geleerden, die niet slechts beschikken over een omvangrijke kennis, doch die bovendien de gave hebben om in woord en geschrift die kennis aan anderen mede te

¹⁾ Zie tans de *Handelingen*, bl. 2.

delen. Vroeg men ons om op het gebied der Engelse taal- en letterkunde de namen te noemen van tien Nederlanders die aan deze eisen voldoen, wij vrezen dat wij nog niet eens zouden komen tot de helft.

Een leerzaam voorbeeld van de moeilijkheden bij het bezetten van leerstoelen in de moderne talen levert de jonge R. K. Universiteit te Nijmegen, waar men, volgens Prof. Huizinga, in 1923 reeds „den roep der tijden [had] verstaan”. Tans beschikt zij over drie leerstoelen in de moderne talen, plus één lectoraat¹⁾. Van deze wordt slechts één professoraat (dat in het Engels), benevens het ene lectoraat, vervuld door een Nederlander. Ook de leerstoel voor het Oudgermaans wordt door een buitenlander bekleed; terwijl de enige Nederlandse hoogleraar nog steeds geen lector naast zich heeft.

Aan de Gemeentelike Universiteit te Amsterdam zal binnen enkele jaren moeten worden voorzien in twee vakatures in de afdeling Engelse taal- en letterkunde. Serieuze kandidaten weet op dit ogenblik niemand te noemen.

Wij geloven dan ook dat, gesteld dat de Regering voor de uitvoering van het Leids-Utrechtse plan te vinden mocht zijn, deze zou geschieden ten koste van het wetenschappelijk peil van het Akademies onderwijs. Tenzij men minstens de helft van alle leerstoelen zou willen bezetten met buitenlanders; doch in dit geval zou men slechts bij uitzondering de beste krachten tot zich kunnen trekken, terwijl men juist de goede dikwels maar voor enkele jaren zou behouden.

Ons voornaamste bezwaar tegen de door Prof. Huizinga voorgestane maatregel is hiermede vermeld. Zijn artikel bevat nog verschillende andere punten die voor tegenspraak, of altans rechtzetting, vatbaar zijn. We kunnen er thans slechts één van aanstippen. Vanaf het ogenblik dat de Amsterdamse Universiteit aan de studie der levende taal een ondergeschikte plaats toeveest door deze toe te vertrouwen aan „assistenten”, hebben wij niet nagelaten tegen deze regeling protest aan te tekenen; het laatst en het uitvoerigst in ons nummer van April 1927. Professor Huizinga's voorstel is geheel op de te Amsterdam en te Groningen bestaande toestand gebaseerd. Wordt het aangenomen, dan wordt daarmede geconsolideerd een regeling die wij zowel voor de taalwetenschap, als voor het onderwijs dat de studenten later zullen moeten geven, schadelijk achten.

Wij eindigen met te herhalen wat wij het vorige jaar reeds schreven. Oprichting van leerstoelen in Utrecht en Leiden moet uitloopen op versnippering van krachten. Wat de moderne philologie in Nederland nodig heeft is niet expansie, doch concentratie.

Docendi Ars Docenda. Het is een verblijdend verschijnsel dat de kwestie van de opleiding van a.s. leraren hoe langer hoe meer de aandacht trekt. Na het waardevolle rapport over de opleiding tot leraar in de wiskunde, waarop wij reeds eerder wezen (zie E. S., Junie 1927, bl. 113) werd van de zijde der leraren in de levende talen deze zomer goed werk verricht door een uitvoerig adres aan de Tweede Kamer (zie E. S., Aug. 1928, bl. 118-119). Terwijl in deze beide stukken een beroep wordt gedaan op anderen (in het ene geval op de fakulteiten, in het andere op Regering en Parlement), zijn de leraren in de klassieke talen de eersten geweest die zelf de hand aan de ploeg hebben geslagen. Het Genootschap van Leraren aan Nederlandse

¹⁾ Niet twee, zoals H. schrijft. Misschien heeft hij de lector in het Italiaans meegeteld, die hier echter buiten beschouwing moet blijven.

Gymnasia besloot tot de oprichting van een biezonder lektoraat in de didaktiek en methodiek der klassieke talen aan de Gemeentelike Universiteit te Amsterdam. Op 9 Oktober j.l. aanvaardde de tot lektor benoemde Dr. L. Alma zijn ambt met een openbare les, onder de kernachtige titel: *Docendi Ars Docenda*.¹⁾

Hoewel wij weinig bewondering gevoelen voor het gebruik dat in de laatste jaren meermalen van het instituut der biezondere leerstoelen, speciaal in de moderne talen, is gemaakt, kunnen wij de instelling van dit lektoraat niet anders dan met volle instemming begroeten. Zonder iets af te doen aan de waarde van enquêtes, rapporten en adressen, achten wij deze eerste stap tot verwezenliking van een in vele geschriften geuite wens van het allergrootste belang. Immers hiermede komt de zaak uit de sfeer der theorie in die van de praktijk, en is een centrum geschapen waar men ervaring zal kunnen opdoen, die later ook aan de opleiding van leraren in andere vakken dan de klassieke ten nutte zal kunnen komen.

De rede van Dr. Alma heeft ons de indruk gegeven dat deze eerste proefneming aan goede handen is toevertrouwd. Hoewel hij classicus, dus academicus, is, gelooft hij niet, zoals sommige academici, dat de Universiteit, die het *ius docendi* verleent, haar leerlingen ook bekwaam maakt voor de uitoefening van dit recht. „De docent moet zijn leerstof *kennen*. Hoe staat het daarmee? Zonder overdrijving mag worden gezegd, dat vele aankomende docenten, om maar te zwijgen van hun onbekendheid met de bestaande leerboeken, hun grammatica onvoldoende kennen, geen moeilijker Latijnsche thema kunnen maken, en gedurende hun studietijd verre zijn gebleven van vele der z.g.n. schoolschrijvers, voorzoover zij niet door 't bijwerken van achtergekommen gymnasiasten daarmee in aanraking zijn geweest. Kortom hun kennis is veelal onvoldoende.” Is het niet alsof men een klacht leest over de akademiese opleiding in de *moderne* talen? Het zal sommige panegyrici vreemd te moede zijn van Dr. Alma te vernemen „dat de gesteldheid van 't tegenwoordig universitair onderwijs, althans onmiddellijk, minder gunstig is voor de practische voor-opleiding van den docent”; en „minder waarborg dan vroeger geeft, dat de docent beslagen ten ijs komt”. Wie zo onbeschroomd de vinger op de wonde plek durft te leggen, boezemt vertrouwen in als heelmeeester.

Wij zouden degenen die, zonder blind te zijn voor de gebreken van het akademies systeem, toch skepties staan tegenover de wenselijkheid om de a.s. leraar gedurende zijn studietijd voor te bereiden op het ambt dat hem wacht, de raad willen geven om van de inhoud van deze openbare les kennis te nemen. Het kan niet anders of ook zij zullen aangenaam getroffen worden door de rustige toon van het betoog, die de lezer doet voelen dat hier iemand aan het woord is die weet wat hij wil, en de weg die tot zijn doel moet leiden, duidelijk voor zich ziet, zonder dat hij de bereiking van dat doel door overdreven verwachtingen in gevaar brengt. „De mij gestelde taak zie ik zoo voor mij: begin met de daad te bewijzen, dat de kunst van onderwijs geven *kan, mag en moet* onderwezen worden.” Het lijkt ons aan geen twijfel onderhevig dat Dr. Alma in deze taak zal slagen; en wij geloven dat de moderne philologie, die reeds zoveel aan haar oudere zuster te danken heeft, goed zal doen ook in dit opzicht bij de klassieken ter school te gaan.

¹⁾ J. B. Wolters, Groningen—den Haag.

Reviews.

A Stanzaic Life of Christ, compiled from Highden's *Polychronicon* and the *Legenda Aurea*, edited by FRANCES A. FOSTER. London. Published for the Early English Text Society by Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press. 1926. Price 35/—.

Dr. Foster, who in 1912-13 placed students of Middle English under a great obligation by her excellent edition of the *Northern Passion*, has again made a valuable contribution to the stores of Middle English religious literature that have been made accessible by the Early English Text Society.

The *Stanzaic Life* has no particular literary value; as regards style and diction it is on a par with the bulk of the Middle English texts of this class. It will, however, appeal to the interest of students of literature, for, as Dr. Foster shows in the Introduction, XXVIIIff., the *Stanzaic Life* must have been known to the author of the *Chester Plays*, who extensively borrowed from it. This circumstance renders it possible approximately to fix the date of the poem. It cannot be later than about 1380, the probable, or at any rate, the possible date of the *Chester Plays*, and not earlier than 1327, the year in which the *Polychronicon*, one of the sources of the *Stanzaic Life*, was finished in its first form. The three MSS. in which the poem has come down to us, all belong to the fifteenth century.

The statement on the title page as regards the sources of the poem appears to be slightly misleading. The 'poet', who undertook his task at the request of a layman, who wished to have a trustworthy English version of certain things concerning Christ's nativity and works he had seen in Latin (Prologue 9—16), began with the fourth book of the *Polychronicon*. "But the *Legenda Aurea* proved so much more to his taste that he ceased using the *Polychronicon* except for occasional passages.... The result looks like a translation of the *Legenda Aurea* with insertions from the *Polychronicon*" (Introduction, XVII).

The author of the *Stanzaic Life* often makes a point of citing his authority, who, with only a few exceptions, always happens to be identical with the one mentioned in the corresponding passage in the *Legenda Aurea* or the *Polychronicon*, but he never once refers to these compilations, which really were the sources from which he drew practically all his material.

The *Stanzaic Life*, which runs into nearly 11000 octosyllabic lines, is divided into four-line stanzas with cross-rhymes. Two consecutive stanzas frequently have the same rhymes, the result being an octave, rhyming *abababab*; in many cases, however, only one rhyme is carried through two stanzas: *abab acac* or *abab cbcb*.

Owing to the fact that the poem, on account of its connection with Chester, can be located, and that the date can be approximately determined, it is important from a linguistic point of view.

In her brief survey of the language of the *Stanzaic Life* (XV f.), Dr. Foster calls attention to three characteristics that are peculiar to the West-Midland dialect, namely, 1. *a* before a nasal is represented by *o*; 2. the endings of the second and the third person present indicative are *-s* and *-s*, *-es* respectively, the ending of the plural being *-n*; 3. the ending of the weak preterite is *-t* rather than *-d*.

Reference might have been made to the reduction of Old French *üi* to *ī*, which is also a characteristic of the West Midland dialect, although instances of *ī* < *üi* are occasionally found in non-West Midland texts. In the *Stanzaic*

Life such examples are very numerous; (*a*)ny 'annoyance', 'trouble' rhymes with *I* 4093, 5649, 5668, etc., with *bitterly* 5157, with *Mary* 5462, with *openly* 5502, with *pryuely* 300, with *prophecy* 5441, with *tenderly* 3858, and with several other words in -*i*; *destr(u)y* rhymes with *apertly* 5796, with *evangelly* 3397, with *Gregory* 1890, with *Mary* 6730, with *pitously* 5562, with *prophecy* 3361, with *twye* 3950, with *worthy* 7017, and with many other words in *i*; *fruyte* rhymes with *delite* 6942.

The dialect of one of the three MSS., namely Harl. 3909 is the West Midland of the original (Introd., XVI); two of the scribes of this MS. use -*u*- for -*e*- in unaccented syllables. Examples would have been welcome. I have noted *appul* 6935; *condulmas(se)* 2142, 2151; *fadur* 6934; *hokur* 5905; *hokurly* 5963; *lentun* 4129, 8150; *mikul* 5927; *opunly(e)* 2815, 5814, 5918; *tempul* 2642; *wrytun* 11; *deuelus* gen. sing. 47; *endud* past part. 53, and further the rhyme *reson* : *lenton* 4149/51 and 4167/5.

The forms *mas* (< *makes*) and *tas* (< *takes*) are Northern, but they are also found in North West Midland texts. The editor does not mention them. *Mas* rhymes with *gras* 'grace' 9715; with *has* 5033; with *manas* 5507; with *pas* 3067; with *plas* 2440, 3323, 3839, 3911; with *trespas* 2242; with *was* 337, 725, 793, 1359, etc. (frequently); *tas* rhymes with *cas* 341; with *has* 6112.

The past participle *tan* rhymes with *began* 7364; with *han* 890, 4086, 4655; with *Octouian* 5120. Although *tan* is characteristic of the Northern and North West Midland dialects, it is occasionally found elsewhere as well. Bokenam, for instance, rhymes *tan* with *man* 30. 916.

I am not in a position to check the correctness of the text, but we may safely assume that it is up to the high standard of all the later publications of the Early English Text Society.

The 'get-up' of the book bears the stamp of superiority characteristic of everything printed at the Oxford University Press. The facsimile of one of the pages of MS. Harl. 3909, placed opposite the title page, clearly brings out the difference between the work of the principal scribe A, and that of scribe B.

Amsterdam.

W. VAN DER GAAF.

A Dictionary of the Low Dutch Element in the English Vocabulary. By J. F. BENSE. Part I (Aam-Dowel) XXXII + 80 pp. The Hague (Nijhoff), 1926.

Niederländisches Lehnwort im Mittelenglischen. Von JOH^S-MICH. TOLL. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, herausgeg. von Lorenz Morsbach und Hans Hecht, LXIX). XXII + 102 pp. Halle (Niemeyer), 1926.

The two authors above-mentioned have been working along parallel lines of late years. Before their purely lexicographical publications both have given a kind of historical introduction: Toll's *Englands Beziehungen zu den Niederlanden bis 1154* (1921) and Bense's *Anglo-Dutch Relations from the Earliest Times to the Death of William the Third* (1925). As may be seen from the titles, it is not exactly the same subject they have undertaken in their most recent books. Toll restricts himself to Middle English, Bense examines the whole "English Vocabulary", drawing the limits as widely as possible: "(he has) not restricted himself to borrowings from Low Dutch that have found a permanent place in the English vocabulary, but (has) included those that formed part of it for some time only, and even such as never got beyond the alien stage, or were used but once" (p. III)

The term 'Low Dutch' is used by Bense in a peculiar sense, viz. in reference to 'those dialects which are usually distinguished by the names *Flemish*, *Dutch* and *Low German*' (p. XV). Dutchmen often feel somewhat hurt in their national feelings, when Dutch is without any ceremony included in the indication 'niederdeutsch' or even 'deutsch'. They may consider themselves revenged by Mr. Bense's procedure, who quietly annexes the whole of Low German to Dutch. It may be doubted whether such a new and uncommon terminology (which suggests the existence of 'High Dutch' by the side of 'Low Dutch') is made necessary or desirable only by the fact that 'English itself is a Low German dialect' (Bense, p. XV). I do not believe any continental or English reader would misunderstand the usual term Low German. Moreover, the contents of the book would hardly have presented any obstacle to the work being simply entitled 'Dutch Element'. For an investigation into Dutch words in English is the author's main purpose. Low German comes under discussion only secondarily, in cases where the Dutch origin of a word is uncertain or impossible.

Bense's book as well as Toll's is preceded by an introduction. Here Bense gives an exposé of the criteria on which the identification of borrowings can be based, and shows how feeble phonological characteristics mostly are, because of the close affinity between the languages in question: hence attention has also to be paid to meaning and to historical data. Toll deals with this 'äussere Geschichte des niederländischen Lehngutes im Mittlenglischen' in a separate chapter.

In the specially lexicological part of their books the authors proceed in different ways. Bense, having briefly set forth his views on phonological characteristics in the introduction, simply gives a 'Dictionary', arranged in alphabetic order after the 'main forms', i.e., as the Preface (p. IV) explains, 'the usual spelling of an extant word, or the most typical of the latest spellings of an obsolete one.' Other spellings are recorded after the 'main form'.

The main part of Toll's book, on the other hand, is formed by what he calls a 'lautliche Untersuchung': he arranges the words from a phonological point of view. At the beginning of every paragraph he gives an outline of the development of an Old West Germanic sound in Middle Dutch, Middle Low German and Middle English, in order to determine, if possible, a distinctive mark of a phonological nature. Of course, he can often only state the absence of such a mark. Within the groupings formed in this way, the words appear in chronological arrangement. Reference is facilitated by an alphabetical list, subdivided according to the degree of certainty with which loan-words are considered as such by the author: 'sichere Lehnwörter', 'wahrscheinliche Lehnwörter' and 'zweifelhafte Lehnwörter'. Besides, we find a list of the loan-words arranged 'nach sachlichen Gesichtspunkten' and an alphabetical list of all the words discussed. No lack of system, therefore.

Independent research work has been done by Toll, more than by Bense, the latter having simply followed the headwords of N. E. D. and D. D., and taken out of them what suited his purpose. Toll, on the contrary, has gone to the sources themselves, making use of a manuscript left by Otto Zippel who was killed in the Great War.

We need not wonder that the reader is not always at once convinced by the solutions given for these delicate and intricate questions of the history of words. The authors themselves wisely leave many a doubtful case unsettled. It is worth observing that our countryman, generally speaking, does not go so far as Toll in assuming borrowing from Dutch. So we cannot accuse Bense of chauvinism. When, e.g., we meet with the words

carde, clappe-cleppe, daffe in Toll, but not in Bense, we may conclude that Bense, in these cases, has rejected the possibility of borrowing. The words *blissen-blessen-bleschyn, bulwerke, dike* are reduced without hesitation to M. Du. *blesschen* (by the side of *blusschen*), *bol(le)werck* and *dijck* respectively by Toll, whereas Bense has his doubts. The comparison, of course, is imperfect, as Bense has not yet finished four letters of the alphabet, and further deals with a great quantity of material that lies outside Toll's limits. But also with regard to words about which we do not know Bense's opinion for the present, Toll often seems to be rather prone to annexation. I mention *hoge-hughe* (< M.Du. *hooch, hoghe*), *toye* (Mod. Engl. *toy*). Both are numbered among the certain loan-words, the latter being reduced to a M. Du. (unrecorded!) predecessor of Mod. Du. *tuig*. Among the words probably borrowed (from M. Du. *groeve*) M.E. *groof* is mentioned. In some cases, the two publications supplement each other in a quite instructive manner, e.g. under *dapper* and *crame*. It is only fair to add that there are also words, as e.g. *creek* and *dell*, where Toll, in his turn, denies or doubts borrowing, contrary to Bense. Furthermore, Bense admits 'loan-words', such as an interjection *baba* or the apparently onomatopoetic *baff* 'a blow, strike, shot' where one is inclined to place a mark of interrogation. Either author, however, plainly enables us to check his conclusions and to follow his argumentation; Toll by the very arrangement of his work, but also Bense, whose detailed articles often swell to small essays.

Thus a Dutchman and a German, each in his own manner, have given useful summaries of Dutch influence on English, which hitherto had not been systematically treated in special works. As for the German, we may appreciate his having made himself pretty well acquainted with Dutch, and with Dutch philological literature. He evidently does not know Schönfeld's *Historiese grammatika* and consequently quotes Te Winkel only. For this reason his way of discussing matters of the history of Dutch sounds now and then makes a somewhat antiquated impression, but serious shortcomings do not result from it, as he is chiefly interested in Middle Dutch, and about that period he is sufficiently informed by Franck's grammar. Apart from a few errors, his citations of Dutch words show greater precision than we often observe with German scholars.

We are looking forward with great interest to the following parts of Bense's *Dictionary*.

The Hague.

C. B. VAN HAERINGEN.

Neuaufbau der Grammatik. Von TH. KALEPKY. 105 Ss.
B. G. Teubner, 1928.

Die Schrift bewegt sich in den Streitfragen der gegenwärtigen Grammatik und Sprachpsychologie. Der Verf. erwähnt im Vorwort, dass er schon vor 30 Jahren zu ähnlichen Auffassungen vom Wesen der Sprache gelangt war, wie sie Wundt in seiner 1900 zuerst erschienenen Völkerpsychologie niedergelegt hat. Besonders die Auffassung des Sprechens als Analyse einer Gesamtvorstellung, nicht als Verbindung von Begriffen, macht der Verf. als gemeinsame Grundlage zwischen Wundt und ihm geltend. Ich halte es aber dafür, dass neben dieser anscheinenden Uebereinstimmung eine kaum geringere Diskrepanz besteht, indem Kalepky seine Ansicht vom Satz des näheren dahin ergänzt, die Analyse der Gesamtvorstellung bestehe in einem *Herzählen der Benennungen der einzelnen Elemente*, das sich als *Subsump-*

tionsakt auffassen lasse. Bei Wundt findet ein Subsumptionsverhältnis nur zwischen Gegenstandsbegriffen, wohl nie aber zwischen Satz- und Vorstellungselementen statt. Verfassers Verwerfung der Konjunktion als Wortart ist eine unmittelbare Folge dieser Diskrepanz: da im Satze immer nur das jeweilige Vorstellungselement mit seinem Worte subsumptiv verbunden werde, so könne von einer Verbindung zwischen Satzelementen nie die Rede sein, es sei denn im Sinne einer reinen Aufeinanderfolge. M. E. wäre dies nur für diejenige Aufeinanderfolge richtig, deren Satzcharakter gerade am problematischsten ist: die Aufzählung. Hat doch gerade Wundt von der Gliederung der Gesamtvorstellung in ihre in logische Beziehungen zu einander gesetzten Bestandteile gesprochen.

Von hieraus versteht es sich auch, dass für K. Subjekt und Praedikat nicht aufeinanderbezogene Elemente des Satzes sind, sondern das Erstere als die sachliche Grundlage der Aussage, das Praedikat als die ganze Aussage erscheint.

Die Schrift enthält manches Radikale und Gewagte, das zum Nachdenken anregen wird. Die Bemerkungen über Ellips und Impersonale sind sehr fein ausgeführt und lassen am wenigsten die Begründung vermissen.

Amsterdam.

H. J. Pos.

Horace Walpole. By DOROTHY MARGARET STUART. (English Men of Letters, New Series). VII + 217 pp. London, Macmillan, 1927. 5/—.

Miss Stuart is an almost painfully accurate biographer, with an amazing command of the English language, which makes the perusal of her book one continuous delight. Yet, with these gifts at her disposal, it is a little disappointing to discover that, finally, she should have failed in producing a clear-cut image of Walpole. She asserts that "the revelation of Walpole's rather complicated and elusive ego... remains incomplete even now". But with the enormous mass of material now available, to which, one is tempted to say, nothing essential can be added, a good portrait might have been achieved. The writer was handicapped in so far, that she wanted "to concentrate upon Walpole's literary activities". But certainly a score of insignificant trifles might have been suppressed, whereas a more careful and intelligent analysis of the letters would have produced a better basis for a biography than his flimsy poetry or much of his superficial prose-work. Miss Alice Greenwood in *Horace Walpole's World* (1913) managed to use the then known letters to much better purpose; she succeeded in clearly indicating Walpole's attitude to various questions and persons, and especially to the "modern taste" in architecture. In that connection a difficulty presents itself with respect to Horry's "Gothicism", which remains unsolved in these books, as well as in the instructive article: *The Word "Gothic" in 18th century criticism*, by A. E. Longueil (Mod. Lang. Notes XXXVIII). All of them consider him as the creator of the new critical meaning of this term: mediaeval, quaint, which I found for the first time in a letter of June 1745, whereas in 1743 we hear of the Florentine school that "their drawing was hard and their colouring gaudy and Gothic". Miss Stuart considers the epithet here as used disdainfully, which undoubtedly it is. I have failed to discover any more traces of this depreciative meaning at a later date. Consequently a change in his appreciation of Gothicism must have taken place between 1743 and 1745. About the cause of this revolution, so important on account of its consequences, we are left in the dark.

I cannot agree with the author when she is induced by his perverted views of literary men to call Walpole "ill-fitted to pass that most testing of all judgments—judgment upon one's contemporaries". I venture to suggest that he was biased by considerations of secondary importance in many cases; as far as literature is concerned, especially by his distaste of "anything that is low" and his horror of sermonizing. Several of his letters testify to his ability to gauge characters and conditions rightly.

A few minor blemishes may easily be removed in a second edition. On page 169 we are acquainted with the ungrateful conduct of the "incomparable" Conway. Why he should still be incomparable on page 174, 179 and 198 must be beyond any reader's comprehension. He certainly was this no longer, considering what Walpole had to say of him in his *Memoirs*, though seemingly the breach was patched up again, as see his letter of May 11, 1769.

As to the origin and number of editions of his "Letter from Xo Ho", the reader may be referred to an article by Mr. W. S. Lewis in *The Times Lit. Supplem.* Aug. 30, 1928, where Père du Halde's *Voyage en Chine*, a book which Walpole possessed, is mentioned as the source of this satire. In its turn it became the model for Goldsmith's *Citizen of the World*.

The Index does not give: *Memoirs* (George III) on page 120; Conway is wrongly indexed on pages 46 and 129, which should be 47 and 130; George Whitefield listed on page 127 does not occur there; Whitehed should have been mentioned on page 126; Montagne is given on p. 151, which should be 150, and should also have been indexed on p. 153.

Students of literary history will certainly regret the absence of a bibliography. Unqualified praise may be accorded to the sections dealing with Walpole's relations with Gray, Mason and Chatterton, as well as to the account of the erection of the (pseudo)-Gothic "castle" of Strawberry Hill.

On the whole this book is an accurate enumeration of facts, yet as a critical biography it seems just below the standard which we have of late years grown accustomed to look forward to from the hands of English biographers.

Rotterdam.

W. A. OVAA.

Anthologies.

An Anthology of Recent Poetry, compiled by L. D'O. WALTERS. — Harrap, 1920.

English Verse Old and New: an Anthology. Edited by G. C. F. MEAD and RUPERT C. CLIFT. — Cambr. Univ. Press, 1922. — 6/— (School edition 4/6).

Modern American Poets: selected by CONRAD AIKEN. — Secker, 1922. — 6/—.

Modern American Poetry. Edited by LOUIS UNTERMEYER. Revised and Enlarged Edition. — Cape. — 15/—.

Sixty-Three Poems. By WILFRID GIBSON. Selected for Use in Schools and Colleges by E. A. PARKER, M.A., PH. D., Professor of English, Wilson College, Bombay. With a Critical Introduction. — Macmillan, 1926. — 2/6.

Anthologies are of different kinds. Some are labours of love; and love is not always a trusty guide, being apt to be beguiled by pretty tricks of speech or by languishing looks. Others are labours of some voluntarily accepted duty, — and a conscientious striving to be fair towards such authors as

fail to attract us though we know they must be represented, the reading public looking for their inclusion (and with good reason), will often give the impression of half-heartedness. Of the five anthologies to be noticed here Conrad Aiken's tasteful book is probably the best, the compiler's task having been throughout a congenial one, thanks to a wise exclusivism and the consequent possibility of representing each deserving author fully and adequately. Untermeyer's exceedingly valuable book is rather too snippety, a defect which, perhaps, was inherent in the scope of the work, but which ought to have been kept down as much as possible, for example by refusing two pages to Gladys Cromwell who, after Emily Dickinson's gnomie verse, brings nothing new. On the other hand, the 'defect' has, by the compiler's skill, been transmuted into an excellence, wherever he has included poems on similar subjects but by different poets, each with a point of view and a technique of his own. Often, it is true, as in the case of Witter Bynner's 'Lincoln', we can hardly speak of technique at all, and then we realize Conrad Aiken's greater fastidiousness.

"And he was a jolly old fellow — always cheerful;
He wasn't so high but the boys could talk to him their own ways.
While I was servin' at the Hospital
He'd come in and say, 'You look nice in here',
Praise us up, you know."

This surely (Untermeyer, p. 293) is the thinnest of 'poetical' wash, and altogether in a different category from John Gould Fletcher's

Wearily the snow glares,
Through the grey silence, day after day,
Mocking the colourless cloudless sky
With the reflection of death.

No sails beat up to the harbour,
With creaking cordage and sailors' song.
Somnolent, bare-poled, indifferent,
They sleep, and the city sleeps.

Mid-winter about them casts
Its dreary fortifications:
Each day is a gaunt grey rock

.

O that the white scroll of heaven might be rolled up,
And the naked red lightning thrust at the smouldering earth !

(Aiken, pp. 130/131.)

Messrs Mead and Cliff claim to have, in their anthology, boldly associated the old and the new on an original plan. The result is pleasing enough, and their book is handy and well got-up, but the 'plan' is not easy to discover, except for the grouping together of certain poems of dreamlike quality, a number of epitaphs, and so on. But the present writer fails altogether to see what mystic tie unites Ralph Hodgson's 'The Bells of Heaven' ¹⁾, which is, very fitly, followed by William Blake's 'robin redbreast

¹⁾ 'Twould ring the bells of Heaven
The wildest peal for years,
If Parson lost his senses
And people came to theirs,
And he and they together
Kneelt down with angry prayers
For tamed and shabby tigers,
And dancing dogs and bears,
And wretched, blind pit ponies,
And little hunted hares.'

in a cage', with Chesterton's well-known, but very cheap, success, called 'The Donkey'. And, speaking of epitaphs, here is one that might perhaps be included in a second edition:

Noel Dark.

She sleeps in bronze, the Helen of his dream,
Within the quiet of my little room,
Touched by a kindling birch-log's fitful gleam
To tenderer beauty in the rosy gloom.

She sleeps in bronze; and he who fashioned her,
Shaping the wet clay with such eager joy,
Slumbers as soundly where the cold winds stir
The withered tussocks on the plains of Troy.

(Wilfrid Gibson, 'Neighbours' p. 95.)

This brings me to the Gibson anthology selected by Professor Parker, who has provided, in an introduction of forty pages, a capable study of the author, whom he is not alone in admiring and even 'preaching'. With his selection there is little fault to find, except that no work has been included from 'Daily Bread', not even 'Summer Dawn'. But I will not cavil: this book is sure to send many a reader to the complete volume published by Messrs Macmillan in the same series with Tennyson and Hardy.

Rather much of the 'recent poetry' in Miss Walters's volume is also to be found in the book compiled by Mead and Clift.... I am afraid that to my 'anthologies of love' and 'anthologies of duty' I must add 'anthologies of psittacism'. Is Lionel Johnson's poem on the statue of Charles the First so very good as to warrant appropriation by each successive anthologist? It lacks grip and terseness, it lacks consistent imagery, it lacks outline. And most of Miss Walters's favourites are weaker stuff than Johnson's.

Zaandam.

WILLEM VAN DOORN.

Bibliography.

POETRY, FICTION, DRAMA.

The Paradise of Dainty Devices. (1576—1606.) Edited by HYDER EDWARD ROLLINS. 10¾ × 7½, lxix. + 299 pp. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press. London: Milford 31s. 6d. n.

The Book of Thel. By WILLIAM BLAKE. Reproduced in Facsimile from the Copy in the British Museum. 11¼ × 8¾. Victor Gollancz. 21s. n.

Swinburne's Hyperion and Other Poems, with an Essay on Swinburne and Keats by GEORGES LAFOURCADE. 8¼ × 6½, 175 pp. Faber and Gwyer. 10s. 6d. n.

Midsummer Eve. By A. E. 8¼ × 5¼. New York: Crosby Gaige. London: Dulau. 31s. 6d. n.

The Oxford Book of American Verse. Chosen and Edited by BLISS CARMAN. 7¾ × 5¼, xxix. + 680 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 10s. 6d. n.

Keeping up Appearances. By ROSE MACAULAY. 7½ × 5¼, vii. + 303 pp. Collins. 7s. 6d. n.

The Taming of the Shrew. (The New Shakespeare). Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-ROUCH and JOHN DOVER WILSON. 7¼ × 4¾, xxvii. + 194 pp. Cambridge University Press. 1928. 6s. n. [See article in this number.]

HISTORY OF LITERATURE, CRITICISM.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. XIII. Collected by CAROLINE F. E. SPURGEON. 8¾ × 5¾, 144 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1928. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Geoffrey Chaucers Kleinere Dichtungen. Nebst Einleitung, Lesarten, Anmerkungen und einem Wörterverzeichnis, neu herausgegeben von JOHN KOCH. Pp. VIII + 260. Englische Textbibliothek, 18. Heidelberg. Winter, 1928. Geh. M. 8.—. [A review will appear.]

Die Funktionen des Erzählers in Chaucers epischer Dichtung. Von H. LÜDEKE. Pp. X + 157. Studien zur englischen Philologie, LXXII. Halle, Niemeyer, 1927. Geh. R.M. 7.—. [A review will appear.]

The Blessed Virgin Mary in the Medieval Drama of England. With additional studies in Middle English Literature. By J. VRIEND, S. J. 23 × 16 c.M., xv + 160 pp. J. Muusses, Purmerend, 1928.

Diss. Amsterdam.

Spenser in Ireland. By PAULINE HENLEY. 7½ × 5¼, 231 pp. Cork: University Press. London: Longmans. 6s. n.

Der weise Narr in der Englischen Literatur von Erasmus bis Shakespeare. Von W. GAEDICK. Phil. Diss. Berlin 1928. 80. pp. iii + 55. (Leipzig: Mayer u. Müller 1928.) 3.50 R.M.

The Assassination of Christopher Marlowe. A New View. By S. A. TANNENBAUM. Pp. 75. 100 copies privately printed. The Tenny Press. New York. 1928. [A review will appear.]

Ralegh's Staatstheoretische Schriften. Von N. KEMPNER. Pp. 138. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster, Heft VII. Tauchnitz, 1928. M. 9. — [A review will appear.]

Imperialistische Strömungen in der englischen Literatur. Von F. BRIE. 2e Aufl. Pp. xv + 285. Halle, Niemeyer. 1928. Geh. R.M. 11.—. [A review will appear.]

Darstellerzahl und Rollenverteilung bei Shakespeare. Von M. SACK. Pp. 76. Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, herausg. von Max Förster, Heft VIII. Tauchnitz, 1928. M. 4.—. [A review will appear.]

Studies in Shakespeare. By ALLARDYCE NICOLL. 7½ × 5, 164 pp. (The Hogarth Lectures on Literature). Hogarth Press. 3s. 6d. n.

Elizabethan Psychology and Shakespeare's Plays. By RUTH LEILA ANDERSON. (Humanistic Studies.) 9¼ × 6¼, 182 pp. Iowa: University of Iowa. \$ 1.50.

Shakespeare's Stratford. By EDGAR I. FRIPP. 7½ × 5, vii + 86 pp. Oxford: University Press. London: Milford. 2s. 6d. n.

Shakespeare, Jonson and Wilkins as Borrowers. A Study in Elizabethan Dramatic Origins and Imitations. By PERCY ALLEN. With an Introduction by R. P. COWL. 7¾ × 5¼, xix + 236 pp. Cecil Palmer. 7s. 6d. n.

How Shakespeare "Purged" Jonson. By ARTHUR GRAY. 8¼ × 5¾, 34 pp. Cambridge: Heffer. 2s. n.

Gründe, die gegen eine Neuübersetzung Shakespeares sprechen. Von HANS ROTHE. Illustr. v. Honoré Daumier. Privatdruck. 80. pp. 14. Leipzig, List 1927.

Shakespeare in the Eighteenth Century. By D. NICHOLL SMITH. Pp. 91. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928. 5/— . [A review will appear.]

The Autobiography of Edward, Lord Herbert of Cherbury. With an Introduction by C. H. HERFORD. 13¾ × 9¾, xv + 94 pp. Gregynog Press. 84s. n.

Milton on Education. The Tractate of Education with Supplementary Extracts from other Writings from Milton. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by OLIVER MORLEY AINSWORTH. (Cornell Studies in English XII.) 8¾ × 6¼, xi + 369 pp. New Haven: Yale University Press. London: Milford. 12s. 6d. n.

Of Dramatick Poesie. By JOHN DRYDEN, 1668. Preceded by a Dialogue on Poetic Drama. By T. S. ELIOT. 12 × 7¾, xxvii + 64 pp. Frederick Etchells and Macdonald. 31s. 6d. n.

Samuel Pepys. By ARTHUR PONSONBY. Pp. xiii + 160. English Men of Letters. Macmillan, 1928. 5/— net. [A review will appear.]

Theology in Augustan Literature. Being an inquiry into the extent of orthodox protestant thought in the literature of Pope's time. By A. A. PERDECK. 21 × 15 c.M., pp. 106. Groningen, den Haag, J. B. Wolters, 1928.

Diss. Amsterdam.

Folklore in the English and Scottish Ballad. By L. C. WIMBERLEY. Pp. xvi + 466. University of Chicago Press, 1928. \$ 5.00.

Smollett and Dickens. By F. D. WIERSTRA. 24 × 16 c.M., pp. 117. C. de Boer Jr., Den Helder, 1928.

Diss. Amsterdam.

Dr. Johnson. By CHRISTOPHER HOLLIS. 9½ × 6¼, 203 pp. Victor Gollancz. 12s. 6d. n.

La Jeunesse de William Beckford et la Genèse de son „Vathek”. Par MARCEL MAY. Pp. 437. Paris, Presses Universitaires. 1928. Prix: 45 francs. [A review will appear.]

The Travel-Diaries of William Beckford of Fonthill. Edited with a Biographical Introduction by GUY CHAPMAN. In Two Volumes. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{4}$. Vol. I. Memoir of William Beckford, Dreams, Waking Thoughts, and Incidents. lxii. + 347 pp. Vol. II. xvii. + 374 pp. Constable. 42 s. net.

William Blake. By C. H. HERFORD. $10\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{3}{4}$, 16 pp. Manchester: University Press. London: Longmans. 1 s. net.

Reprinted from the *Bulletin* of the John Rylands University.

Mysticism in Blake and Wordsworth. By J. KORTEING. $24\frac{1}{2} \times 16$ c.M., pp. 174. Amsterdam, H. J. Paris, 1928.
Diss. Amsterdam.

Lyrical Poetry from Blake to Hardy. By H. J. C. GRIERSON. Pp. 159. Hogarth Lectures, no. 5. The Hogarth Press, 1928. 3/6 net. [A review will appear.]

Wordsworth in Early American Criticism. By ANNABEL NEWTON. $8 \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, ix. + 210 pp. Chicago: University Press. London: Cambridge University Press. 12s. 6d. n.

The Ravenna Journal. By GEORGE GORDON BYRON, sixth Lord Byron. Mainly compiled at Ravenna in 1821 and now for the first time issued in book form. With an Introduction by the RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD ERNLE, M.V.O. 9×6 , 100 pp. First Edition Club. 15s. n.

Byron en het Byronisme in de Nederlandsche Letterkunde. Door T. POPMA. 24×17 c.M., IX + 416 pp. H. J. Paris, Amsterdam, 1928.

Diss. Amsterdam.

Mary Shelley. By RICHARD CHURCH. 92 pp. (Representative Women Series.) $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$. Gerald Howe. 3s. 6d. n.

The Life of William Hazlitt. By P. P. HOWE. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, ix. + 484 pp. Martin Secker. 7s. 6d. n.

First published in 1922 at 24s.

George Eliot's Family Life and Letters. By ARTHUR PATERSON. $8\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, x. + 254 pp. Selwyn and Blount. 21s. n.

Rossetti: His Life and Works. By EVELYN WAUGH. 9×6 , 232 pp. Duckworth. 12s. 6d. n.

The Letters of Dante Gabriel Rossetti to his Publisher, F. S. Ellis. Edited, with introduction and notes, by OSWALD DOUGHTY. $9 \times 7\frac{1}{4}$, xlviii. + 150 pp. Scholartis Press. 15s. n.

Anthony Trollope. By HUGH WALPOLE. $7\frac{3}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, vii. + 205 pp. Macmillan. 5s. n.

George Meredith als Paedagog. Von O. SENFT. 80. pp. 138. Langensalza, Beyer 1928 = Mann's Paedag. Magazin. H. 1162 = Philos. u. paedag. Arb. H. 21. 3.60 R.M.

Thomas Hardy as Man, Writer, and Philosopher. An appreciation, with a Swedish Hardy bibliography. By R. E. ZACHRISSON. Pp. 29. Studies i modern språkvetenskap, X. Uppsala 1928.

Modern Engelsk Världsåskådning i Litteraturens Spegel. Av R. E. ZACHRISSON. Pp. 176. Uppsala och Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksells Förlag, 1928.

Essays on Hardy, Kipling, Galsworthy, Shaw and Wells.

Stalky's Reminiscences. By Major-General L. C. DUNSTERVILLE, C.B. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{3}{4}$, 298 pp. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

The Pilgrimage of Henry James. By VAN WYCK BROOKS. $8\frac{1}{4} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$, ix + 170 pp. Jonathan Cape. 7s. 6d. n.

Barrie. A Critical Estimate. By THOMAS MOULT. $6 \times 5\frac{1}{4}$, 192 pp. Jonathan Cape. 5s. n.

Letters from Conrad, 1895 to 1924. Edited with Introduction and Notes by EDWARD GARNETT. $9\frac{1}{4} \times 6$, xxxiii + 335 pp. The Nonesuch Press. 25s. n.

The Structure of the Novel. By EDWIN MUIR. Pp. 151. Hogarth Lectures, no. 6. The Hogarth Press, 1928. 3/6 net. [A review will appear.]

Phases of English Poetry. By HERBERT READ. Pp. 158. Hogarth Lectures, no. 7. The Hogarth Press, 1928. 3/6 net. [A review will appear.]

Somerset Maugham et ses Romans. Par PAUL DOTTIN. Pp. 221. Paris, Perrin & Cie., 1928. 12 fr. [A review will appear.]

LANGUAGE.

A Short History of English. By H. C. WYLD. Third edition, revised and enlarged. Pp. vii. + 294. London, Murray, 1927. 10/6 net. [A review will appear.]

Grundzüge der Geschichte der Englischen Sprache. 2., erw. u. verb. Aufl. Von U. L. LINDELÖF. 80. pp. vi. + 160. Leipzig, Teubner, 1928. 5.20 R.M.

A Modern English Grammar on historical principles. P. 1: Sounds and Spellings. By O. JESPERSEN. 4. ed. 80. pp. vi. + 485. Heidelberg, Winter 1928 = Germ. Bibl. I, 1, IX. 10.— R.M.

Altenglisches Lesebuch für Anfänger. Von MAX FÖRSTER. Pp. x + 69. Dritte verbesserte Auflage. Heidelberg, Winter, 1928. M. 2.—.

Beowulf-Materialien zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen. Zusammengestellt von M. FÖRSTER. 5., verb. Aufl. Kl. 80. pp. 28. Heidelberg, Winter, 1928 = Germ. Bibl. I, 3, VII. 0.85 R.M.

The Kenning in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Poetry. By H. VAN DER MERWE SCHOLTZ. 24 × 16 c.m., viii + 180 pp. Utrecht-Nijmegen, Dekker & Van de Vegt en J. W. van Leeuwen, 1927.

Diss., Utrecht.

Über Tonvokal + ht im Frühmittelenglischen. Von C. MAHLING. Phil. Diss. Berlin, 1928. 80. pp. viii + 200. Leipzig, Mayer u. Müller, 1928.

The Early London Dialect. Contributions to the History of the Dialect of London during the Middle English Period. By BARBARA ALIDA MACKENZIE. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 5 $\frac{1}{4}$, 151 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford, 1928. 7s. 6d. n. [A review will appear.]

Das mittenglische Versgedicht 'The Seege of Troye'. Eine philologische Untersuchung nebst einem Abdruck der drei Handschriften. Von L. HIBLER-LEBMANNSPORT. I: XII + 212 pp.; II: IV + 64 pp. Graz, Moser, 1928. Mk. 5.—. [A review will appear.]

Shakespeare's English. By GEORGE GORDON. (S.P.E. Tract No. XXIX.) 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ × 6, pp. 255-276. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 1928. 2s. 6d. n.

[The author announces that he is writing 'a book on Shakespeare's language, considered in its whole extent'.]

A Contribution to the Study of the Conversion of Adjectives into Nouns in English. By CARL BERGENER. Pp. XVI + 222. Gleerupska Univ.-Bokhandeln, Lund, 1928. [A review will appear.]

Der Gedanke einer englischen Sprachakademie in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart. Von H. M. FLASDIECK. Pp. VIII + 246. Jenaer Germanistische Forschungen, II. Frommansche Buchhandlung. Jena. 1928. Brosch. M. 13.—. [A review will appear.]

A New English Dictionary on Historical Principles. Edited by SIR JAMES A. H. MURRAY, HENRY BRADLEY, W. A. CRAIGIE, and C. T. ONIONS. Concluding part. Wise-Wyzen. 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ × 10 $\frac{3}{4}$, pp. 193-400. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford, 1928. 20 s. net.

The Collected Papers of Henry Bradley. With a Memoir by ROBERT BRIDGES. 9 × 7, x. + 296 pp. Oxford: Clarendon Press. London: Milford. 25 s. net.

American Pronunciation. By H. KURATH. Pp. 279-297. S. P. E., Tract No. XXX. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1928. 2/6 net.

Leerboek der Phonetiek. Inzonderheid met betrekking tot het Standaard-Nederlandsch. Door H. ZWAARDEMAKER Cz. en L. P. H. EIJKMAN. Pp. xii + 336. Haarlem, Bohn, 1928. Ingen. f 8.25, geb. f 9.50. [A review will appear.]

S. P. E. Tract No. XXXI. *Needed Words.* By L. P. SMITH. — *Words wanted in connexion with arts.* By R. FRY. — *Jeremy Bentham and word-creation.* By G. WALLAS. Pp. 313-334. Clarendon Press, 1928. 2/6 net.

HISTORY; BIBLIOGRAPHY.

England from Wordsworth to Dickens. By R. W. KING. Pp. xv + 249. English Life in English Literature, nr. 6. Methuen, 1928. 6/— net. [A review will appear.]

Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature. Vol. VIII, 1927. Edited for the Modern Humanities Research Association by D. EVERETT and E. SEATON. Pp. 201. Bowes & Bowes, Cambridge, 1928. 6/6 net. [A review will appear.]